COLLECTED WORKS OF ERASMUS

VOLUME 75

This page intentionally left blank

COLLECTED WORKS OF ERASMUS

CONTROVERSIES

APOLOGIA ADVERSUS ARTICULOS ALIQUOT PER MONACHOS QUOSDAM IN HISPANIIS EXHIBITOS

RESPONSIO ADVERSUS FEBRICITANTIS CUIUSDAM LIBELLUM

EPISTOLA AD QUOSDAM IMPUDENTISSIMOS GRACCULOS

edited and translated by
Charles Fantazzi

University of Toronto Press

Toronto / Buffalo / London

The research and publication costs of the
Collected Works of Erasmus are supported by
University of Toronto Press

© University of Toronto Press 2019
Toronto / Buffalo / London
utorontopress.com
Printed in the U.S.A.

ISBN 978-1-4875-0276-8

Printed on acid-free paper with vegetable-based inks.

Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication

Erasmus, Desiderius, –1536
[Works. English]
Collected works of Erasmus.

Includes bibliographical references and indexes.
Contents: v. 75. Controversies
ISBN 978-1-4875-0276-8 (v. 75 : hardcover)

I. Title.

PA8500 1974 199'.492 C740-06326X

University of Toronto Press acknowledges the financial assistance
to its publishing program of the Canada Council for the Arts
and the Ontario Arts Council, an agency of the Government of Ontario.

Canada Council for the Arts Conseil des Arts du Canada

ONTARIO ARTS COUNCIL
CONSEIL DES ARTS DE L'ONTARIO
an Ontario government agency
un organisme du gouvernement de l'Ontario

Funded by the Government of Canada Financé par le gouvernement du Canada

Collected Works of Erasmus

The aim of the Collected Works of Erasmus
is to make available an accurate, readable English text
of Erasmus' correspondence and his
other principal writings. The edition is planned
and directed by an Editorial Board, an Executive Committee,
and an Advisory Committee.

EDITORIAL BOARD

William Barker, University of King's College
Alexander Dalzell, University of Toronto
James M. Estes, University of Toronto, *Chair*
Riemer Faber, University of Waterloo
Charles Fantazzi, East Carolina University
James K. Farge, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies
John N. Grant, University of Toronto
Paul F. Grendler, University of Toronto
James K. McConica, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, *Chair Emeritus*
John O'Malley, Georgetown University
Mechtilde O'Mara, University of Toronto
Hilmar M. Pabel, Simon Fraser University
Jane E. Phillips, University of Kentucky
Erika Rummel, University of Toronto
Robert D. Sider, Dickinson College
James D. Tracy, University of Minnesota
Mark Vessey, University of British Columbia

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

James M. Estes, University of Toronto
Riemer Faber, University of Waterloo
Charles Fantazzi, East Carolina University
Lynn Fisher, University of Toronto Press
Paul F. Grendler, University of Toronto
James K. McConica, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies
Jane E. Phillips, University of Kentucky

Suzanne Rancourt, University of Toronto Press, *Chair*
Robert D. Sider, Dickinson College
Mark Vessey, University of British Columbia
John Yates, University of Toronto Press

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Jan Bloemendal, Conseil international ASD
Amy Nelson Burnett, University of Nebraska-Lincoln
H.J. de Jonge, Leiden University
Anthony Grafton, Princeton University
Ian W.F. Maclean, Oxford University
Clarence H. Miller, Saint Louis University
Mechtilde O'Mara, University of Toronto
J. Trapman, Conseil international ASD
Timothy J. Wengert, The Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia

Contents

Introduction
ix

An Apologia of Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam
Against Several Articles Presented by Certain Monks in Spain
Des. Erasmi Roterodami apologia adversus articulos aliquos per monachos quosdam in Hispaniis exhibitos
1

The Answer of Desiderius Erasmus
to the Pamphlet of a Certain Fever-ridden Individual
Desiderii Erasmi responsio adversus febricitantis cuiusdam libellum
185

Letter to Certain Highly Impudent Jackdaws
Epistola ad quosdam impudentissimos gracculos
213

Works Frequently Cited
220

Short-Title Forms of Erasmus' Works
223

Index of Biblical Sources
229

Index of Greek and Latin Words Cited
232

General Index
234

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction

On 1 September 1526 Erasmus received a letter from Juan Maldonado, a learned cleric in Burgos, assuring him of the continued favourable reception of his works in Spain, but also warning him that he had enemies there among jabbering Scholastic theologians and fractious monks, for the most part Franciscan and Dominican friars.[1] He informs Erasmus of the enormous success of the Spanish translation of the *Enchiridion,* of which thousands of copies had been printed. He is anxious, however, that Erasmus become reconciled with the monks so that those who stand out in character and learning will understand that he was not guided by a spiteful temperament. A few days after Erasmus' receipt of Maldonado's letter Alonso Fernández, a renowned preacher in Palencia and translator of the *Enchiridion,* writing to Luis Núñez Coronel, secretary of Archbishop Alonso Manrique de Lara, Inquisitor-general of Spain, tells him of a Franciscan priest in Palencia, Juan de San Vicente, who was preaching violently against the *Enchiridion,* claiming that it contained a thousand heresies.[2] Fernández describes how the preacher brandished a scroll containing thirty propositions or articles from the *Enchiridion* and the *Paraclesis*, some of which, it is presumed, may have been brought forward in the inquisitorial assembly that would be convened in Valladolid on 27 June 1527.

By March of the following year it was clear that monks of various religious orders had collected a series of articles drawn from Erasmus' works to be presented to the Inquisition. Erasmus first found out about this from a letter sent to him on 13 March 1527 by Pedro Juan Olivar, a close friend of the imperial chancellor, Mercurino Gattinara, who was a great admirer of

* * * * *

1 Ep 1742

2 This is one of six letters exchanged between Spanish admirers of Erasmus printed in Allen VI Appendix 18. This one was written in Spanish. CWE 12 527–8

Erasmus.[3] Olivar also informed him, however, that he had numerous supporters in Spain who were interceding on his behalf, such as Alfonso de Valdés, secretary of Gattinara, and Luis Núñez Coronel. Erasmus wrote a long response to Maldonado (Ep 1805), which never reached him because it was retained by Alonso de Valdés, to whom it had been jointly addressed. Valdés judged that the letter contained things that should not be made public, and in a letter to Erasmus urged him not to publish it, which he did not (Ep 1834).

In the spring of 1527 the muttering and slander directed against Erasmus had reached such intensity that some action had to be taken by ecclesiastical authorities. The sequence of events is reported to Erasmus in a lengthy letter from Juan de Vergara, who had collaborated in the famous Complutensian Polyglot Bible and was secretary to Alonso de Fonseca, archbishop of Toledo, in which office he was instrumental in promoting the cause of Erasmus in Spain.[4] He reports that after the publication of the Spanish translation of the *Enchiridion* his enemies were proclaiming everywhere that Erasmus was a heretic, a blasphemer, impious, and sacrilegious. To calm these disturbances Don Alonso Manrique de Lara summoned a group of monks of high repute from several religious orders to a meeting before the council (*la Suprema)* of the Inquisition to expose their grievances. According to Vergara it was reported that the monks were severely reprimanded for spreading these rumours and were ordered to refrain henceforth from their attacks and to moderate their sharp tongues. They on their part insisted that they could no longer turn a blind eye to the grave errors and blasphemies of Erasmus and allow Christian souls to be seduced by diabolical deceptions. In the end the council concluded with a declaration by the church authorities that they would make a judicial investigation into the matter and issued a further warning that the monks should refrain from their vociferations. The meeting was adjourned and the monks immediately set about scrutinizing various works of Erasmus, noting down what they perceived to be errors, or even heresies. Finally, on 28 March, the representatives of the orders were summoned once again before the supreme council of the Inquisition. To quote Vergara: 'Behold! Our

* * * * *

3 Ep 1791. At the beginning of the letter, as we have it, Olivar states that he is sending Erasmus the twenty-one articles that were drawn up against him, but the opening page (or pages) of the letter are missing from both the original manuscript at Wroclaw and the earliest printed version, which leads us to believe that they must have contained the articles.

4 Ep 1834. Fonseca himself had asked Vergara to write this letter after being informed by Erasmus of the plots being devised against him.

monks emerged from their hiding places stuffed to the gills with heresies.'[5] Each one presented his accusations against Erasmus or in many instances, commendations of his writings. Among them were a Dominican friar from Salamanca, and a Franciscan, probably Francisco Castillo, a confirmed anti-Erasmian, who may well have played a major role in drawing up the list of alleged errors of Erasmus.[6] A Benedictine, Jerónimo Ruiz de Virués of Olmedo, in a solemn and lengthy speech gave great praise to Erasmus for his services to the cause of Christian piety. His speech was received with general acclaim, according to Vergara. He was followed by an Augustinian, identified as Dionisio Vázquez, of Toledo, court preacher for Charles v, who also spoke of Erasmus in the most honorific terms. The last to speak was a Trinitarian, conjectured by James Farge to be Benet Safont of Barcelona, superior general of the order, who also had words of praise for Erasmus.[7] None of these was present at Valladolid. After a full day of these proceedings the members of the council, observing that many of the communications presented were substantially the same, ordered the theologians to condense their charges into a single report and bring it back for their inspection.

A few days later the monks presented the composite version to be read and examined by a group of theologians. Vergara mentions that there were some from Alcalá and others from Salamanca, but as James Farge has observed, other faculties were also represented.[8] The meeting for the discussion of these charges was fixed for Ascension Day, a movable feast which fell on 3 May in that year, but it did not convene until much later. Vergara voices the suspicion in his letter that the dossier of the monks was largely put together in the workshop of Erasmus' inveterate enemy Edward Lee, who had been sent by Henry VIII as ambassador to Spain at the court of emperor Charles v. Erasmus would have been quick to believe this allegation and indeed referred to it himself in letters to various persons. Erika Rummel has sensibly conjectured that the reference to Lee's 'workshop' may have

* * * * *

5 Ep 1814:246–7

6 According to Carvajal *Apologia monasticae religionis diluens nugas Erasmi* 24v

7 Ep 1814 n35. Pedro Juan Olivar mentions in a postscript to his letter to Erasmus (Ep 1791:78–80) that Safont was a great supporter of his.

8 Ep 1814 n39. There were representatives from other universities as well, including six graduates of the Paris faculty of theology, Pedro de Lerma, who had ties with Alcalá, and the famous Thomist, Francisco de Vitoria, who held the prestigious '*prima*' chair of theology in Salamanca. The others were Antonio de Alcaraz, who taught at Valladolid, the Portuguese Diego de Gouveia and Juan de Quintana, all of whom would participate in the full assembly of Valladolid.

meant nothing more than that his *Annotations* to the first two editions of Erasmus' *Annotations on the New Testament* had supplied the source material for the censures.[9]

After various delays the conference began in Valladolid on 27 June 1527. The meetings, which were held in the palace in which the inquisitor-general was residing during his visit to the city, were solemnly inaugurated with a Mass of the Holy Spirit. Manrique opened the proceedings with a discourse on the subject matter to be discussed. The theologians swore on a missal to speak and vote as God and their conscience dictated and to maintain secrecy about what was said there. The assembly met regularly every Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday from 27 June to 13 August. The members of the assembly were professors of theology, bishops, preachers and confessors, members of religious orders, and rectors of universities. At the beginning, according to Vergara's letter, Manrique seems to have chosen participants solely from the University of Salamanca, all of them inimical to Erasmus, and from Alcalá, where he was held in great favour. Later, theologians from various other colleges and universities were added to the group. Among these were the Portuguese Diego de Gouveia, who proved to be the most severe of Erasmus' critics; Antonia Guevara, bishop of Guadix, categorical in his negative pronouncements, declaring all of Erasmus' works anathema; Martín de Samunde, provincial vicar of the order of Nuestra Señora de la Merced, very partial to Erasmus; Juan de Quintana, a long-winded and querulous adversary; Luis Coronel Núñez, secretary of the inquisitor-general and staunch supporter of Erasmus. The University of Valladolid was well represented in the assembly. Don Alonso Enríquez, abbot of Valladolid, was distinctly sympathetic to Erasmus' cause, while others, like Fernando di Préjano, rector of the university, were clearly opposed. Diego Cabrero, a famed theologian and preacher, prefaced his remarks with this glowing tribute: 'In primis, teneo et iudico Erasmum esse verum et orthodoxum Christianum, vita et moribus religiosum, de universali Ecclesia orthodoxum et de omnibus studiis benemeritum'[10] (To begin with, I hold and judge Erasmus to be a true and orthodox Christian, who has deserved well of the universal orthodox church and of all studies). On the opposing side, Diego Gouveia exclaims that not

* * * * *

9 Erika Rummel 'Erasmus and the Valladolid articles: Intrigue, innuendo and strategic defense' *Erasmus of Rotterdam the Man and the Scholar* ed J. Sperna Weiland (Leiden 1988) 69

10 Vicente Beltrán de Heredia, O.P. *Cartulario de la Universidad de Salamanca* vol 6 (Salamanca 1972) 35

even a pagan would say what Erasmus, who calls himself a Christian, says and propagates. It often occurs that a member of the assembly favours Erasmus concerning some of the charges and criticizes him with respect to others. Miguel Gómez, a theologian from the school of Bologna, quoting from Gregory the Great's *Moralia,* wisely advised the assembly that they should judge not just the works themselves but the intention of the writer.

The Inquisitor-general added certain renowned preachers to the assembly, some favourable to Erasmus, like Alonso de Virués and Gil López de Béjar, and others decidedly hostile, like Francisco Castillo, Antonio de Guevara, and Juan de Salamanca. From the religious orders there were three Dominicans, three Franciscans, one Benedictine and one Augustinian. As Alfonso de Valdés shrewdly remarked in a letter to Erasmus sent from Valladolid on 20 June 1527 (Ep 1839), the Franciscans and Dominicans present, once the greatest of enemies, now conspiring together for his destruction, had become the best of friends. From his knowledge of those present at the sessions of the assembly Valdés made an accurate prediction that the vote would be equally divided. In August he wrote a letter to Maximus Transsilvanus, giving his frank adjudication of the assembled monks, corroborating his previous analysis.[11]

The names and titles of all those present at Valladolid together with a brief summary of individual opinions, as preserved in the National Archives in Madrid, were first published in 1902.[12] In addition to this document the full transcriptions of the Valladolid opinions were published by Vicente Beltrán de Heredia, as mentioned in note 10 above.[13] From these latter records one can observe the reactions of the various religious orders as the sessions proceed. The mendicant monks, who depended for their livelihood on begging and charity, felt very threatened by Erasmus' attacks on them. In general, the other orders, the Benedictines, Augustinians, and Trinitarians, and the provincial superior of the order of Nuestra Señora de la Merced, being more self-sufficient, were less prone to condemn Erasmus. It is noteworthy that Carranza de Miranda, who had previously written a mild criticism of Erasmus' *Annotationes ad Novum Testamentum,* came to his support at the conference.

* * * * *

11 Fermin Caballero *Conquenses illustres* 4 (Madrid 1875) 336–7

12 Antonio Paz y Meliá, Manuel Serrano y Sanz 'Actas originales de las congregaciones celebradas en 1527' *Revista de archivos, bibliotecas y museos* 6 (1902) 60–73

13 Future references to this collection will be listed simply as Heredia. For more detailed biographies of the participants see Marcel Bataillon *Erasme et l'Espagne* ed. Daniel Devoto and Charles Amiel (Geneva 1991) 260–4.

In contrast to Erasmus' numerous antagonists who aimed their criticism at his revisions of the Latin New Testament, and unlike Zúñiga who attacked individual works, the theologians preferred to concentrate their attention on essential dogmas and beliefs. The twenty-one articles or *propositiones* presented, of which Pedro Juan Olivar had dispatched a copy to Erasmus on 13 March, comprised the following subjects: the Holy Trinity, the divinity of Christ, the divinity of the Holy Spirit, the holy Inquisition; the sacraments of baptism, confession, the Eucharist, and matrimony, the authority of sacred Scripture, dogmatic theology, the authority of the fathers of the church, the honour due to the Blessed Virgin, the authority of church ceremonies, the rules of fasting and abstinence, celibacy, Scholastic philosophy, indulgences, the cult of the saints, the right of private ownership, free will, the pains of hell. Under each subject heading suspect texts of Erasmus were cited.

A good example of the divergent opinions and lengthy discussions of the participants is seen in the very first accusation, an amalgam of charges that constitute a veritable formal indictment, as Erasmus noted in his response, rather than a simple 'article' for deliberation. It reads: 'In his annotations on the first Epistle of John, chapter 5, Erasmus vehemently defends corrupt manuscripts. He pleads and defends the cause of the Arians, impugning with inexorable hostility the passage, "There are three who bear testimony in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, and these three are one,"[14] and he repudiates all supporting evidence, heaps up frivolous reasons to the contrary from all sources, and attacks St Jerome in these words, "although he is often impetuous, unrestrained, wavering, and inconsistent."'[15] The hyperbole and inexactitude of these charges are immediately evident and prompted an elaborate defence by Erasmus. The charge of defending the Arians had to be refuted vehemently even though he had already done so in his various controversies with Edward Lee, especially in the discussion of 1 John 5:7, usually referred to as the *Comma Johanneum*.[16] He begins with a barrage of no less than 80 excerpts from various works with minimal comment before giving his formal response, which is very lengthy. The sources of these excerpts range from his *Paraphrases* on the Gospels and Epistles, beginning with 20 quotations from the *Paraphrase on John* 1:1–17, to the forceful preface to his edition of Hilary (Ep 1334), to

* * * * *

14 This added verse is now generally regarded as a Latin gloss that was inserted into the text as early as the third or fourth century.

15 *Annot in 1 Joannis Epistolam* ASD-10 542:291–2

16 *Controversies with Edward Lee* CWE 72 403–19

devotional works like his sacred poems and prayers, the *Expositions of the Psalms*, and other miscellaneous works.

Concerning the proof-text 1 John 5:7, Erasmus omitted it from his first edition of the New Testament, saying that he did not find it in any Greek manuscripts that he had consulted, not defending them, as his accusers claimed, but without approval or disapproval, as he had written to his antagonist, Edward Lee.[17] It must be pointed out before describing the ensuing debate that in the third edition of his *Novum Testamentum* (1522) Erasmus relented and inserted the passage, stating that he did so lest anyone have the opportunity of calumniating him.[18] Obviously, this unrepentant motivation did not mollify his accusers. Perhaps he had finally decided to hearken to Lee's admonition that the omission of the passage might bring about a revival of Arianism. At any rate, in his response to Lee's new annotations he had written: 'If I had come across a single manuscript that had the reading we have in our text [ie the Latin Vulgate], I would certainly have added what was missing in the other manuscripts. Since that was not the case, I did the only thing possible, indicating what was lacking in the Greek texts.'[19] That manuscript suddenly materialized, a sixteenth-century manuscript, named the Codex Montfortianus after one of its possessors, Rev. Thomas Montfort. It is now at Trinity College, Dublin, in which the Epistles, at least, seem to have been added hastily by several different hands, with alterations of the Greek to fit the Latin, and with the addition of the *Comma Johanneum*.[20] Although he included the *Comma* in the third edition, Erasmus voiced the suspicion that it had been revised to agree with the Latin manuscripts, and he was right.[21]

All twenty-nine theologians responded to the grave imputation contained in the first article, and twenty-three of them defended the canonicity of this passage with varying degrees of indignation. The first to speak, Antonio de Alcaraz, a professor at Valladolid, professed a firm belief in the authenticity of the text; he affirmed, secondly, that it is temerarious to deny its canonicity; thirdly, he declared that Erasmus is not guilty of any wrong

* * * * *

17 Ibidem 404

18 *Ne cui sit ansa calumniandi*, ASD IX-10 546:344. *Adagia* I iv 4

19 CWE 72 404, slightly adapted

20 Cf Bruce Metzger *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption and Restoration* (Oxford 2005) 88, 146.

21 For perceptive discussions of this matter see Henk Jan de Jonge '*Erasmus and the Comma Johanneum*' *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 56 (1980) 381–90, and Grantley McDonald *Biblical Criticism in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge 2016) 29–55.

since he merely says that he did not find the passage in the Greek manuscripts at his disposal, and besides, he included it in his *Paraphrases* without raising the slightest doubt about its content.[22] He adds another telling point, that Pope Leo X gave his full approval of Erasmus' edition of the New Testament, in which this passage is not included.[23] Diego Cabrero, Bishop of Pulati in Albania and later of Huesca, corroborates Alcaraz' views, specifying that Erasmus failed to find the passage in seven Greek manuscripts, including one from the Vatican (he refers here to the famous Codex Vaticanus, which Paolo Bombace checked for Erasmus in Rome). He cites Erasmus' verification that neither Cyril of Alexandria nor Bede nor Augustine recognized the passage. In Cabrero's opinion Erasmus should be praised, not blamed, since he reinserted the verse in the third edition on the strength of a single Greek manuscript. He does not defend corrupt manuscripts, as charged, but emends them. Moreover, it is not heretical to have omitted this passage because the church has not yet pronounced on it. The bishop goes as far as to say that to call Erasmus a supporter of the Arians is a defamation deserving of grave punishment and could give rise to a pernicious scandal within the Christian republic.[24] Eight delegates expressed their conviction that Erasmus was merely following the principles of textual criticism in rejecting the verse, since he did not find it in the Greek manuscripts and restored it when he did. On the other hand, others considered his action dangerous and scandalous, while still others did not hesitate to call it heretical. Gouveia, the Portuguese bishop, proclaimed that anyone who suppressed this verse should be burned at the stake, and any text not containing it should likewise be burned.[25] Francisco de Vitoria sums up the discussion in very formal Scholastic language, saying that even in the latest edition Erasmus still leaves the reader in doubt, and therefore his comments should be expunged or emended.[26]

The second part of this article, which concerns Erasmus' rather frank remarks about St Jerome, was censured by the majority of the respondents, although many had reservations about the gravity of the offence.[27] One inquired sarcastically whether it was their task to pronounce on rudeness of language. Others said that these few angry words could hardly be compared

* * * * *

22 *Paraphrases on the First Epistle of John* CWE 44 348 n9
23 Heredia 24
24 Ibidem 36–9
25 Ibidem 72
26 Ibidem 115
27 See n15 above.

to Erasmus' monumental edition of Jerome. Gouveia remarked that only a pagan would say such things and that Erasmus was truly audacious to call Jerome inconstant when he himself was a notorious example of unpredictability. In defence of Erasmus it must be said that he uttered these words in response to Zúñiga, where he quotes a passage from the pseudo-Jerome prologue to the Catholic Epistles, in which the author claimed that heretics had removed the passage.[28] Erasmus of course was not aware that this was a spurious work. He does at least politely prefix his words with an apology, 'I should not wish to disparage his authority,'[29] which the monks omitted. His characterization of Jerome, however, is not far from the truth. He was known to be a man of harsh and even cantankerous temperament, as is seen in his letters and polemical works. Nevertheless, many of the theologians found Erasmus' words to be rash and disrespectful, but not heretical by any means. Martín de Samunde, vicar of the Merced order, protested that their mission was not to judge rudeness of language.[30]

There was considerable discussion of Erasmus' use of the word *ratiocinatio*, ie speculative reasoning, to explain the mystery of the unity of the essence of the Trinity rather than by reference to biblical proof-texts and abstruse theological argument. In his note to 1 John 5:7 Erasmus advocates pious studies which will make us more like Christ.[31] On this same subject he wrote a long diatribe in his exegesis of 1 Tim 1:6 on the subject of *curiositas*.[32] Surprisingly, most of the assembly were in agreement with Erasmus on this matter, but Gouveia and another Portuguese prelate, Esteban de Almeida, considered his discussion of this matter scandalous. Francisco de Vitoria, with his usual moderation, admits that this kind of investigation can be useless at times, but that it can also be put to good use in defending the doctrine of the Trinity, as was done by the fathers of the church. He introduces a more incriminating sentence from Erasmus' *On Praying to God*: 'Perhaps it is a good principle of Christian doctrine to revere everything pertaining to divinity

* * * * *

28 *Prologus septem epistolarum canonicarum* PL 29 870–3, quoted in *Apologia ad Annotationes Stunicae* ASD IX-2 254:483–7

29 *Apologia ad Annotationes Stunicae* ASD IX-2 254:476. He says the same thing at *Annotationes in 1 Ioannis epistolam* 5:7 ASD VI-10 542:291.

30 Heredia 105

31 ASD IX-10 544:330–2

32 ASD VI-10 10–30. *Curiositas* is defined as an excessive speculation in matters of dogma. The French theologian Jean Gerson (1363–1429) wrote a tract against this tendency, *Contra curiositatem studentium.*

but to affirm nothing except what is explicitly stated in the scriptures.'[33] This sounds suspiciously like Luther. López de Béjar interjects that Erasmus modified this sentiment in the second edition, where he states that it was not his teaching, but that of another,[34] and in his defence also adds that this sentiment is found in Pseudo-Dionysius and John Damascene. Other Erasmians pointed out that it was only a hypothetical statement, not his personal opinion. Gouveia scoffs at this, saying that it is just another of Erasmus' evasions, prefixed by his frequent palliative *fortasse* ('perhaps'). More controversial was a categorical statement in this same section of *On Praying to God* that St Hilary in his *De trinitate* nowhere dares to declare the Holy Spirit to be God.[35] Vitoria strongly criticizes Erasmus for putting the religion of the early fathers over present beliefs. He brands the passage as scabrous and dangerous, but at the same time hopes that Erasmus will understand these criticisms in a catholic sense. He deems that such pronouncements as these can do serious harm to the faith of the weak and the young, and therefore should be removed or corrected.

On 8 July the discussion of the second article, which concerned the divinity of Christ, was hotly debated. In his answer to Zúñiga, who had claimed that there were ten passages in the New Testament in which Christ is called God, Erasmus admitted only two of them to be relevant, John 1:1 and John 20:28, the words of Thomas, 'My Lord and my God.' The theologians were particularly offended by Erasmus' casting doubt upon a phrase in Romans (Rom 9:5). I shall quote it in Latin because there are so many variations in English translations: 'ex quibus [the Israelites] est Christus secundum carnem, qui est super omnia Deus benedictus in saecula.' With this punctuation 'Deus' definitely refers to Christ, but Erasmus in the first three editions of the New Testament indicates that if a comma were placed after 'omnia,' the following phrase could constitute a doxology to God the Father, as often occurs in the New Testament. The monks who criticized this incidental remark omitted a clause towards the end of the annotation in which Erasmus plainly disavows what he suggested: 'In a similar way, the clause might seem to have been added to mark the conclusion of the argument and the beginning of a new section, were there not such great agreement among all the

* * * * *

33 CWE 70 186. 'Fortasse haec est bona pars christianae religionis in rebus divinis, venerari omnia, nihil autem affirmare praeter id quod in sacris literis palam expressum est.' ASD V-1 146:867–9

34 The second edition appeared in March 1525.

35 CWE 70 185–6 / ASD V-6 146:859

witnesses.'[36] The truth is of course that most of the participants had not read the original annotation but only the 'article.' Some of the monks were disturbed by what they called another of his tergiversations, while completely ignoring the initial statement of Erasmus in the annotation: 'Certainly, in this passage Paul clearly called Christ God, and the Greek copies, at least those I have seen, are in agreement.'[37] They also make no mention of the *Paraphrase*, which affirms the traditional interpretation that Christ is here declared to be God.[38] The dubious statement was removed in the 1527 edition, which most of the assembled inquisitors had not seen, although Luis Coronel, secretary to Manrique, testifies that he saw this edition, where the offending phrase was omitted.

The monks selected yet another sentence for criticism from the treatise *On Praying to God*, in which Erasmus says that St Hilary strove in twelve books to show that the Son was true God although the Father alone was said to be true God in the Gospels.[39] Hilary, called the Western Athanasius, went to great lengths in his *De trinitate* to prove the divinity of Christ against the Arians, saying for example that Christ is true God, being born of his Father, who is true God.[40] Unfortunately, Erasmus added his own comment, 'although the Father alone was said to be true God in the Gospels,' which is an undeniably true statement, but this enraged some of his hearers for it seemed to them that Erasmus was denying that Christ is true God. Thus Esteban de Almeida sees this as favouring the Arian position, claiming that the logical conclusion to this would be 'Only the Father is God.'[41] Francisco Vitoria takes it one step further, accusing Erasmus of using the word 'Gospel' to mean the whole New Testament, which would then make his statement false and heretical. This is the kind of casuistry that pervades the taunts of Erasmus' adversaries.

The session on the denial of the divinity of the Holy Spirit began on 22 July. Once again St Hilary is the centre of discussion. Four statements in the preface to Erasmus' edition of Hilary are condemned in the article: 1) 'St Hilary at the end of the twelfth book of *De trinitate* does not dare to make any pronouncement about the Holy Spirit except that he is the Spirit of God,

* * * * *

36 CWE 56 251
37 CWE 56 249
38 'But Christ is a man in such a way that at the same time he is God.' CWE 42 53
39 CWE 70 185 / ASD V-1 146: 857–8
40 *De trinitate* 1.13 PL 10 35B–C; 1.38 PL 10 49B–C
41 Heredia 28

and he would not have dared to say even this unless he had read it in St Paul.'[42] 2) 'Nowhere does he write that the Holy Spirit must be adored and nowhere does he attribute the word God to him.'[43] 3) 'Though in Scripture the name of God is several times attributed to the Son, it is nowhere attributed to the Holy Spirit.'[44] 4) 'We dare to call the Holy Spirit God, which the ancients did not dare to do.'[45] To prove him wrong it would have been necessary to produce texts of Hilary not mentioned by Erasmus which declared the Holy Spirit to be God. But Alcaraz, coming to his defence, states that even if such a passage were found, he still could not be accused of having denied the divinity of the Holy Spirit. Castillo refers vaguely to chapters 3 and 6 in 1 Corinthians without citing any specific verse, and to a letter of Hilary in which he says the Holy Spirit is called God.[46] Several others refer to a letter of Hilary in which he says that the Holy Spirit is called God. The one passage that several orthodox believers adduced to disprove Erasmus is very questionable. In Acts 5:3 Peter says to Ananias, 'Why has Satan filled your heart to lie to the Holy Spirit?' and at 5:4 he says, 'You did not lie to us, but to God.' This does not necessarily prove that there is a specific identification of the two words, as his opponents would have us believe. The validity of these verses as a proof of the Trinity is still very much disputed. Bataillon calls it '*une jonglerie verbale.*'[47] Alcaraz cites Erasmus' observation that none of the collects, ie established prayers of the Mass which vary from day to day, is addressed to the Holy Spirit,[48] adding that this is true also for the prayers prescribed for the Divine Office in the *Rationale divinorum officiorum.* Cabrero confirms the exactness of Erasmus' reference to Hilary's *De trinitate*, as does Pedro de Ciria, canon of León, who insists that no one who has read Hilary requires any proof of this statement.[49] The more conservative theologians were not convinced. They still considered these inferences of Erasmus as dangerous and scandalous. The majority voted against Erasmus' statements about the Holy Spirit.

* * * * *

42 Preface to his edition of St Hilary Ep 1334 78–81
43 Ibidem 440–1
44 Ibidem 450–4
45 Ibidem 475–7
46 Heredia 47. This must refer to his *Contra Arianos vel Auxentium Mediolanensem* PL 10 593–602. No such statement is contained there.
47 Bataillon 278
48 Heredia 26, with reference to CWE 70 184 / ASD V-1 144: 831–3
49 Heredia 49

In the prolonged discussions of these three principal accusations there were no sufficient grounds for charging Erasmus with teaching or supporting Arianism. He does not deny any dogma of the church. After these subtle nuances concerning the doctrine of the Trinity the topic quite incongruously changes to a much less elevated subject, the *raison d'être* of the Inquisition itself. The subject comes from the *Paraphrase on Matthew* 13:24–30, the parable of the wheat and the tares. In Erasmus' interpretation the slaves who want to gather the tares before the time is right are those who think that false apostles and heretics should be tortured and removed from our midst by the sword, while the householder stands for those who do not want them to be destroyed, but to be tolerated in case they come to their senses and repent, and from tares be turned into wheat.[50] In the preface to the *Paraphrase* Erasmus informs the reader that he will be using Chrysostom's *Homily on Matthew,* since the Greek father had also used the parable of the tares to argue against the killing of heretics.[51] But in his answer to the accusations of the Spaniards he writes a more elaborate disquisition on the theme, much longer than the original annotation, citing not only Chrysostom but Theophylact, Jerome, and a long homiletic discourse from Augustine's *De quaestionibus evangelicis.*[52] Most of the delegates, Vitoria among them, sided with Erasmus on this issue or passed it over with no comment. Miguel Gómez cites several letters of Augustine in support of Erasmus' interpretation.[53] Almeida, in opposition, resorts to a comparison with the quelling of the *Comuneros* rebellion by violent measures, advocating that *a fortiori* heretics must be punished in the same way as enemies of the state.[54]

In the preface addressed to the pious reader in the *Paraphrase on Matthew* Erasmus speaks about the widespread ignorance of the sacred books among Christians and suggests as a partial remedy that those who were baptized as children should be asked when they have reached the age of discretion to attend sermons in order to learn what the sacrament of baptism invokes. Then they should be carefully examined in private by virtuous men to see whether they have understood their instruction. This would be followed by a public renewal of their baptismal profession of faith in a solemn ceremony.[55]

* * * * *

50 CWE 45 215
51 *Homily on Matthew* 46.2 PG 58 477
52 *De quaestionibus evangelicis* 1.12 PL 35 1370
53 Heredia 71
54 The *Comunero* uprising of the Castilian municipalities began in May 1520 and was put down by force on 23 April 1521.
55 CWE 45 20

He adds that if the subject is reluctant, he should be left to his own inclinations until he returns to his senses.[56] This proposal was condemned by Béda and the Paris theologians. Likewise, it did not find ready acceptance among most of the delegates. Ciruelo adjudicated that under the guise of piety it contained a noxious poison and should be rejected.[57]

While on the subject of the Inquisition the monks cited another work of Erasmus that gave offence, his colloquy *Inquisitio de fide*, in which in a kind of mini-inquisition there are two speakers, Aulus, representing either Erasmus or any orthodox believer, and Barbatius, representing Luther or any Lutheran. Barbatius ridicules the pope's power of excommunication, referring to the papal bull *Exsurge Domine*, which threatened Luther with excommunication and anathema. At the very beginning of the dialogue Barbatius scoffs at the harmless thunderbolt hurled by the pope, saying that God alone has a thunderbolt to strike the soul.[58] Even though these words are spoken by a supposed heretic in the dialogue, they can easily be misinterpreted by an uneducated person, according to some of the delegates. Yet Jerome and Augustine, for example, often wrote dialogues of this sort, in which heretical statements are made by personages engaged in the dialogue, as Miguel Gómez points out.[59] Castillo's terse judgment is that Erasmus leaves the reader perplexed.[60] Pedro Margalho advocates that Erasmus be brought to trial before the tribunal of the Inquisition for his radical derision of faith and morals.[61] Several of the anti-Erasmians make use of the saying of the Greek writer Menander, and adopted by St Paul, 'Bad communications corrupt good morals' (1 Cor 15:33), to condemn the *Colloquies* as a whole, and demand that they be removed from circulation. Even some of Erasmus' supporters objected to his treating spiritual matters jocosely in a fictitious colloquy. If his opponents had read the whole colloquy they would have learned that Erasmus demonstrated in the interrogation of Barbatius that a Lutheran could entertain orthodox beliefs concerning the Apostle's Creed. At the end of the dialogue Aulus exclaims, 'When I was at Rome I did not find anyone so sincere in his belief.'[62] This would have caused even greater consternation among them.

* * * * *

56 CWE 45 22
57 Heredia 53
58 CWE 39 422:8–9
59 Heredia 71
60 Ibidem 47
61 Ibidem 89
62 CWE 39 430:30

Beginning on 10 August the assembled monks and theologians submitted their votes and opinions in writing and this continued until 13 August. On that day Manrique delivered a long discourse,[63] announcing that he had reluctantly to adjourn the meetings because of the pestilence that had now stricken the city of Valladolid. Each member then expressed his views, and after a long discussion it was resolved that they would continue to study the articles and await further instructions from the inquisitor-general about the reconvening of the assembly. On the eve of the feast of the Assumption of the Virgin Manrique departed to the nearby monastery of Abrojo. As Bataillon justly observed, we cannot conclude with any certainty whether Manrique intended to put an end to the investigations. The papal brief of Clement VII issued on 1 August had not been very favourable to Erasmus' cause, enjoining Manrique to call together four of the most learned theologians in Spain to examine and appraise certain books of Erasmus in which statements of Luther were quoted verbatim, and to decide which of his books were to be read and which were not to be read.[64] In the end there was no clear victory for either side, but the anti-Erasmians had suffered a severe setback in these proceedings.[65] To argue over fragments randomly extracted without sufficient context from very disparate texts proved to be a frustrating exercise. It was apparent, as was pointed out by some of the more fair-minded among the examiners, that most of the accusers had not read the works from which the articles were excerpted, especially the *Annotationes in Novum Testamentum*.

A pivotal figure in the proceedings was the eminent Dominican and Thomist theologian, Francisco de Vitoria, appointed in 1526 to the prestigious '*prima*' chair at Salamanca, the leading school of theology in all of Spain. In a letter sent to Erasmus before the assembly was convened Juan Luis Vives had assured Erasmus that Vitoria had often defended his cause before a crowded assembly of theologians in Paris and that he admired and revered him. But, as James Farge notes with convincing historical proofs, there is no documentary evidence – and little likelihood – that this was true.[66] While it is true that Vitoria's criticisms are politely phrased in precise Scholastic language, he takes Erasmus to task for his vagueness of language, his temerarious

* * * * *

63 'Un grande razonamiento,' as recorded in the *Actas originales* 64
64 Ep 1846:10–25. At the end of the brief, however, the pontiff instructs Manrique to call upon those preachers inimical to Erasmus to desist from their attacks.
65 *Actas originales* 72–3
66 Ep 1836 n10

propositions and his doctrinal errors. Francisco's greatest concern is that Erasmus gives scandal to the weak, whose faith is shaken by his contentions. His concluding remarks before the assembly are quite compromising: 'It is possible and reasonable to believe that Erasmus understands in a very Catholic sense the imputations that have been brought against him, but his teachings will be of no profit for strengthening the faith, and can do much harm to the faith of the weak, the thoughtless, and the young, who can be led into various doubts by this reading, and suspect that the truths of the faith are not as substantial as they once thought. We must not disregard the scandal of the weak and must avoid idle gossip. The only solution is that these and similar utterances of Erasmus must be eliminated or amended. And I do not think Erasmus will object to what I have said.'[67]

In a letter from Burgos written on 29 November (Ep 1908) Juan de Maldonado warns Erasmus once again, this time recording not hearsay but criticisms that he heard directly from one who was present at the assembly. The description of the conversation points clearly to Francisco de Vitoria. According to Maldonado the interlocutor admitted that Erasmus was a sincere and Catholic Christian but that there were things in his writings that should be eliminated. Immediately after this meeting, Maldonado continues, this cleric ran into citizens who were ardent followers of the monks and in their presence proposed that all of Erasmus' writings should be consigned to the flames. Erasmus would certainly not have divined that this person was Francisco de Vitoria after hearing from Vives that he was totally devoted to Erasmus. Still relying on Vives' account, Erasmus wrote a letter to Francisco, but he obviously did not even know where the Dominican theologian was. The salutation of the letter is to a Spanish theologian of the Sorbonne, whereas Vitoria had returned to Spain from Paris in 1523. It is quite strange that Erasmus does not address him by name throughout the letter, but only refers to his brother, whom he calls Pedro, who was stirring up the people against

* * * * *

67 *'Ultimo dico omnia ista Erasmo objecta ejusmodi esse ut si ipse maxime catholicam sententiam tenuerit, ut credere par est, tamen ad confirmandam fidem nihil sint profutura, et infirmorum aut levium aut novorum hominum fidei plurimum obesse possint, qui in varias suspiciones ex ea lectione trahi possunt, ut ea quae fidei sunt non tam constare suspicentur quam antea credebant. Atque adeo hujusmodi pusillorum scandalum non contemnendum et hominum sermones vitandos. Quod fieri alia ratione non potest quam ut haec et similia Erasmi dicta aut tollantur aut corrigantur. Et haec puto me dixisse ipso Erasmo non invito.'* Heredia 116–17

Erasmus by his preaching.[68] Erasmus humbly asks that Francisco recall his brother to saner judgment. He then relates that his enemies are secretly seeking the help of Francisco's (never addressed by name) college, which would have referred erroneously to Paris. It is very unusual that Erasmus was so misinformed about such an important figure, and it is likewise highly improbable that Vitoria ever received this letter.

On 26 August Erasmus had written a letter to Manrique, unaware that the Valladolid assembly had already been adjourned. In his opening words he alerts the Archbishop that he has learned from the letters of friends about the commotions and calamities certain Dominican and Franciscan friars had stirred up there in Spain. He expresses his gratitude to him for his efforts in repressing or at least controlling those hornets. Without directly revealing that he was already in possession of the preliminary list of articles that had been sent to him, he specifies the various charges lodged against him: 'Against the most holy Trinity of God,' 'Against the divinity and glory of Christ' etc. As he will repeat in the *Apologia*, he says, 'These are not the charges of a judicial inquiry but the verdicts of judges.'[69] Erasmus argues that these calumnies arise from their ignorance of the Greek and Latin tongues and their unfamiliarity with figures of speech since they are always speaking in syllogisms and corollaries. Quite unrealistically, he demands that they read all his works, a catalogue of which he had already sent ahead. He expresses his concern that he is becoming the cause of dangerous discord in Spain, so much so that the country may be plunged into chaos. He prefers that the storm should be settled even if it must be to his own detriment. In a postscript he asks that the Archbishop order them to present their articles in the legitimate fashion in use among theologians rather than simply heap up accusations randomly. And here he quotes exactly the series of abusive allegations they use in the first objection, a clear indication that he had access to the entire list, and may even have begun to write his response.

This was only the first of a series of letters that Erasmus wrote to dignitaries and friends, some of them late answers to letters received before the meetings in Valladolid. On 2 September he wrote a belated response to

* * * * *

68 The identification of this person has been much disputed. In brief it may be said that he is so named in the *Actas originales* and in Heredia, 118–20, but beginning with Alonso Getin *El maestro Fr. Francisco de Vitoria: su vida, su doctrina e influencia* (Madrid 1930), and continuing with Ricardo García Villoslada 'Erasmo y Vitoria' *Razón y fe* 107 (1935) 19–38; 340–50, he is called Diego. Most modern Spanish historians call him by this name.

69 Ep 1864:175–6

Alonso de Fonseca, Archbishop of Toledo and Primate of Spain, thanking him for his kind letter of consolation and mentioning the many other prelates and princes who had written him letters of encouragement. On the same day he wrote a response to the long letter of 24 April from Juan de Vergara, secretary to Fonseca. First he lists the many labours that have kept him from writing sooner. Then he hurls his usual insults against the monks, who boast that they obey God rather than men, which, he admits sarcastically, they do religiously, but after the example of those of whom St Paul writes, 'Their God is their belly' (Phil 3:19). It would be better, in his view, that the mendicant orders be made subject to their bishops, as are other clerics. Aware that Spaniards are possessed of a vehement and ardent temperament, he fears that a clash of partisan interests in his regard may create a discord which would endanger the tranquility of the country. He repeats, in more drastic terms, what he had intimated to Manrique: 'I should prefer that serenity could be restored at the price of my head alone, if it were possible, than that I should be the occasion of this tempest.'[70]

The next letter (Ep 1877), dated the same 2 September, and addressed again to Manrique, is a hastily composed first draft of the *Apologia*, which he would complete later that month. It is not a formal letter, but begins simply with the heading 'Sketch of a response to the articles censured by the monks.' The document was written out by a secretary and sent in duplicate, but was headed, corrected, subscribed and addressed in Erasmus' own hand. It sketches out in abbreviated form the first quarter of the final version. Erasmus addresses here only the first two articles and includes only twenty-five of the eighty doctrinal quotations that served as a preface to his response. In these latter brief discussions the wording is almost the same as in the *Apologia* although there he inserts asides and rhetorical questions to the reader and makes comparisons with the heretical doctrines of the Arians. He omits citations from minor works such as poems, prayers, and other devotional writings. With respect to the one hundred objections he makes brief, provisional replies only to the first five, which are the most important of all. At the end there is a brief personal message in which Erasmus apologizes for its brevity, stating that he had no more time because the couriers were about to set out.

Epistle 1879 is the first preface to the *Apologia*, written shortly after the preliminary sketch in Epistle 1877. He would send an 'advance copy' of the definitive version some weeks later, printed by Froben, but not yet published,

* * * * *

70 Ep 1875:155–7

promising in an accompanying letter that it would not circulate generally until it had received Manrique's official approval. He explains in that letter that rather than have ten exemplars copied out by hand for their perusal by Manrique's adjudicators, which would have taken an inordinate amount of time, he chose to have them printed. Obviously, this was a subtle apology for having the work printed before receiving approval from Manrique, which was officially never given.[71] In the preface to the second edition of the work, published in March 1528 (Ep 1967), Erasmus made a much more detailed apology. He describes it as a triple apology for the *Apologia* itself, one to appease the most reverend Archbishop, another to appease his learned friends, and a third to placate his enemies. Once again he justifies his independent decision to have the book printed, which he did only on the condition that Froben would deliver ten copies to Erasmus and put the rest aside so that they would not fall into anyone's hands without the express wish of his Excellency. But because of the confusion created by the sudden death of Froben someone in Cologne succeeded in procuring a copy and was making arrangements to have it printed. Erasmus was thus constrained to have the book published in a revised version. To appease his friends, who often berated him for wasting good hours in responding to everyone's petty criticisms, he explains that he had to respond to his detractors to save his reputation. He assures them that he did so discreetly, with a gentle touch. To appease his enemies, who complain that their reputations have been damaged, he says categorically that it would have been an act of impiety not to refute the charges laid against him. There can be no imputation of guilt against one who defends his innocence, but rather the entire burden of guilt lies with those who made the accusations. He affirms that he does not cast their accusations back at them, but merely calls their action an impudent calumny. And yet he does not mention names although the ringleaders of the tumult are known to him. In answer to their potential claim that they committed nothing to print he retorts that they spread their calumnies with their wagging tongues in all regions of the world in diverse languages. In an eloquent peroration Erasmus declares that the Lord has confused the tongues of the earth. It is necessary that all conceive Christ in their minds and speak of God with one mouth. The wrath of the Godhead can be extinguished only by tears of repentance, prayers, and self-mortification, a duty especially incumbent on

* * * * *

71 Alfonso de Valdés, imperial secretary, in a letter of 23 November, also strongly advised him against publishing it, but of course the letter was much too late to have any influence.

monks, with whom at one time the church took refuge whenever the wrath of God pressed hard upon it.

In a letter to the reader appended to this second edition (Ep 2094) Erasmus gives a brief account of the background and proceedings of the Valladolid conference, how the monks were instructed by the inquisitor-general to condense the material they had amassed so that the case could be tried. He describes the scabrous attacks made against him and the efforts of the presiding prelate to maintain some kind of order, to no avail. He then records that an outbreak of the plague caused the meetings to be adjourned, adding that the conduct of the monks had been so bad that the archbishop was happy not to reconvene the assembly. In conclusion Erasmus insists that he holds no prejudice against monks in general but only against those who had abandoned the moral standards set by their founders, Dominic and Francis.

To this same edition Erasmus appended a list of revisions of certain works of his, entitled *Loca quaedam in aliquot Erasmi lucubrationibus per ipsum emendata*. These included the revised edition of Jerome of 1524–6, Psalm 85 of 1528, the 1527 edition of the New Testament, and the 1524 composite volume of the *Paraphrases* on the Gospels and Acts. He explains to the reader that he had been warned in a dream that he did not have long to live. Therefore, he decided to correct some errors, resulting for the most part from the carelessness of scribes and printers, but at no point does he admit to the charge of impiety. As Erika Rummel has convincingly shown, only in a few instances do these changes correspond with the criticisms of his Spanish censors. In the 1535 edition of the Annotations he made some concessions to them but not as much through changes to the text as through further clarification of his exegeses.[72]

The *Apologia* had certain repercussions both in Spain and elsewhere. One polemical reaction came from the Franciscan monk, Luis de Carvajal, who wrote an *Apologia monasticae religionis diluens nugas Erasmi*, first published in Salamanca in 1528.[73] Another, more indirect response came from Gerardus Geldenhouwer Noviomagus (ie of Nijmegen) (1482–1542). He had been on quite friendly terms with Erasmus at least from the latter part of the year 1516. The two met probably in Mechelen in August 1519 and again in Bruges in the following year. Geldenhouwer entered the service of Philip

* * * * *

72 Erika Rummel *Erasmus and His Catholic Critics* 2 96–8

73 For a discussion of this book together with the translation of Erasmus' answer, *Responsio ad cuiusdam febricitantis libellum*, see below pp 186–8.

of Burgundy, bishop of Utrecht, in 1514 and remained in this post until the bishop's death in 1524. He had already begun to sympathize with the reformers and at this juncture in his life he set out for Wittenberg and came under the influence of Luther and Melanchthon. In 1526 he moved to Strasbourg, where in cooperation with the press of Christian Egenolff he began publishing a series of letters arguing for toleration in the treatment of heretics. The first volume contained three letters to various princes published in 1526. In the third of these, addressed to the Duke of Geldern, he proclaims that only God can end heresies with the sword of his word and the fire that he has set upon the earth when the church of Christ will triumph over the church of Rome. In 1527 he wrote an epistle to Charles V, in which it is clear that he had read the section of Erasmus' *Supputatio errorum in censuris Bedae* answering Béda's criticism of his views on the punishment of heretics. Geldenhouwer disagrees with Erasmus about allowing the state to execute heretics if they were insurgents and blasphemers. In 1529 he published three separate pamphlets that contained excerpts from the *Apologia adversus monachos quosdam Hispanos* having to do with the punishment of heretics by the civil authorities. The excerpts in question came from Erasmus' answers to Objection 22 of the Spaniards, *Contra sanctam haereticorum inquisitionem*.[74]

One of the three pamphlets, published in the spring of 1529, contained only a small portion of Erasmus' *Responsio* (LB 1057 A–E), some comments of his own, and the three letters to the princes. The second, which survives in German, has a much larger segment of the *Responsio* (LB 1054C–1057E), but no letters of Geldenhouwer. The third bore the title *D.Erasmi Roterdami Annotationes in leges pontificias et caesareas de haereticis. Epistolae aliquot Gerardi Noviomagi.* It appeared in the autumn of 1529 and a German translation was published in December 1529. Erasmus saw the first of these in Basel as he was preparing to move to Freiburg. His answer to this unauthorized usurpation of his texts was the *Epistola contra quosdam qui se falso iactant evangelicos*, a title that was later shortened by Erasmus himself to *Epistola contra pseudoevangelicos*. It appeared in early December 1529 from the press of Johann Faber Emmeus in Freiburg. Erasmus is surprisingly temperate in his remonstrations with Geldenhouwer, saying that he could not be angry with such a friend even if he wanted to. He wishes to rectify certain opinions attributed to him, stating unequivocally that he nowhere taught that capital punishment

* * * * *

74 For a full discussion of Geldenhouwer's views see Cornelis Augustijn 'Gerard Geldenhouwer und die religiöse Toleranz' *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 69 (1978) 132–56.

should not be visited upon heretics nor did he anywhere take the right of the sword from princes. He merely advises that princes should not be too hasty in taking severe measures and should not readily lend an ear to indictments made by any theologian or monk whatever.[75]

Geldenhouwer foolishly published an unauthorized edition of Erasmus' own work in March 1530 together with his comments. Bonifacius Amerbach informed Erasmus of the publication in a letter of 24 March 1530 (Ep 2289) and sent him a copy. A few days after receiving it Erasmus sent off a letter to the magistrates of Strasbourg, informing them that Geldenhouwer had published the *Epistola*, accompanied by notes of his own, described by Erasmus as 'a womanish tirade,'[76] in contravention of the city's edict, since neither the name of the printer nor the date of publication was given. By using arguments from Erasmus' apologia against the Spanish monks Geldenhouwer probably hoped to strengthen his own more audacious convictions about tolerance towards heretics. It was also an attempt to make it appear that Erasmus was an inspiration for the reformist programs.

Erasmus' *Apologia* also attracted the interest of Sebastian Franck (1499–1542), a man who began his religious career as a Catholic priest, then became a Lutheran pastor, was subsequently associated with a community of Anabaptists, and finally dissociated from all religious sects. In his *Chronica* or *Zeytbuch und Geschychtbibel,* first published in 1531, he includes a chronicle of heretics in which Erasmus is named. His principal source for this section of the book was the *Apologia adversus monachos quosdam Hispanos*, which he read from beginning to end, translating or summarizing the hundred objections of the Spanish monks and sometimes including Erasmus' answers.[77] He singled out many passages in Erasmus' answers that he regarded as flagrantly opposed to Catholic dogma, such as his attitude towards papal authority, auricular confession, the existence of hell fire. In the matter of coercion versus toleration in dealing with heretics Franck sided with Erasmus, translating several pages from his long response to objection 22 on the subject of the Inquisition. When Franck's *Chronica* appeared in 1531 Erasmus was warned that in a section on emperors there were many citations of his in the preface that contained slanderous statements against the imperial majesty and a

* * * * *

75 CWE 78 224
76 Ep 2293:4
77 I am indebted in this discussion to the chapter 'Sebastian Franck Scrutinizes Erasmus' *Annotationes* to the New Testament' in Peter G. Bietenholz *Encounters with a Radical Erasmus* (Toronto 2009) 13–37.

libellous description of Erasmus as a heretic. Without hesitation Erasmus sent a formal complaint to the Strasbourg magistrates which resulted in Franck's imprisonment.

Michael Servetus or Miguel Serveto (c 1511–53) while still a teenager attended the Valladolid conference as secretary to Juan de Quintana, who would later become the confessor of Charles V. It is known that he was greatly influenced by the teachings of Erasmus manifested at that meeting, especially concerning the doctrine of the Trinity. This led to his publication in 1531 of *De trinitatis erroribus* by the press of Johann Setzer in Hagenau, but the book was condemned by the Swiss reformers. In this book Servetus rejected the received doctrine of the Trinity, maintaining that it was not based on the Bible but on Greek philosophy, and advocated a return to the teachings of the early church fathers. At one point he attempted to submit his work to Erasmus for his comments but without success. Assuming a different name, he travelled to France, where he studied medicine and lectured on astrology. He was denounced as a heretic and was imprisoned by the Inquisition in Vienne. He escaped but was apprehended at Geneva, where at the instigation of Calvin he was tried and convicted of spreading heresy, and burned at the stake in Geneva in 1553.

EDITIONS OF THE TEXT

Des. Erasmi Roterodami apologia adversus articulos aliquot per monachos quosdam in Hispaniis exhibitos. (Basel: Froben 1528)

Apologia adversus articulos aliquot per monachos quosdam in Hispaniis exhibitos. Per Des. Erasmum Roterodamum. (Basel: Thomas Wolff 1529) Reprint of Basel, Froben 1528.

Des. Erasmi Roterdami apologia adversus articulos aliquot per monachos quosdam in Hispaniis exhibitos: ab autore recognita et aucta. Item loca quaedam in aliquot Erasmi lucubrationibus per ipsum emendata. (Basel: Hieronymus Froben, Johannes Hervagius et Nicolaus Episcopius 1529)

This last text is reproduced in the *Opera omnia* of 1540 IX 825–892 and in LB IX cols 1015–1094. I have used the latter text, correcting various misprints, which are signalled in the notes.

Des. Erasmi Roterodami apologia adversus articulos aliquot per monachos quosdam in Hispaniis exhibitos ed Charles Fantazzi. *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami*, IX-9, pp. 225–399. (Leiden 2018)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I acknowledge with deep appreciation the help and encouragement of the Toronto Erasmians, James M. Estes, James K. Farge, John Grant, and Erika Rummel. For assistance in the multiple references to the Scriptures in the *Apologia* I thank Robert D. Sider, who came to my aid on numerous occasions. I am beholden also to Rev. Thomas G. Weinandy and Luc Deitz for their scholarly advice in tracking down some obscure sources. I am also most grateful to the two anonymous readers who saved me from many a careless error.

THE APOLOGIA OF ERASMUS OF ROTTERDAM AGAINST SEVERAL ARTICLES PRESENTED BY CERTAIN MONKS IN SPAIN

Des. Erasmi Roterodami apologia adversus articulos aliquot per monachos quosdam in Hispaniis exhibitos

TO THE MOST REVEREND FATHER AND LORD IN CHRIST ALONSO MANRIQUE, ARCHBISHOP OF SEVILLE AND CHIEF INVESTIGATOR IN MATTERS OF THE FAITH IN SPAIN, ERASMUS OF ROTTERDAM GIVES GREETINGS[1]

'Pylos there is before Pylos,' as the joke in ancient comedy has it,[2] but the new tragedy[3] that is burning at white heat in these times suggests another saying: There is an apology before an apology, and there is no end or limit of apologies.

When this apologetic book was about to see the light of day, most honourable Bishop, I saw immediately that there would be need of a triple apology for the apology itself, one to appease your Highness, another to satisfy my learned friends, and a third to placate my enemies. It certainly would not be at all fitting to give offence to a bishop who, in addition to the illustrious lineage and the dignity of his high office, is pre-eminent in every virtue, nor would it be prudent to alienate the feelings of one on whose approval will depend not only my entire case but also the wishes of so many pious and learned men, who seem to be more concerned about this matter than I am myself. But I see that I need not be excessively preoccupied about this, since I am engaged in a just cause presided over by a sovereign judge, who is no less equitable and sagacious than he is supreme. Nothing makes you more worthy of this title of supreme than that you surpass by your goodness your prerogatives of nobility, dignity, and authority.

As promised, I had resolved to suppress the book, even if it entailed a financial loss, if I thought that this would have been more agreeable to your Excellency.[4] Indeed it was with the greatest reluctance that I had recourse to the collaboration of printers here, but I thought that there would be need of many copies for those who were charged with the duties of investigating this affair. I was aware too of how seldom packages sent to such far-off regions

* * * * *

1 The translation of this letter is by Charles Fantazzi, Ep 1967, and the notes, slightly modified to be adapted to this apologia, are by James Estes.

2 *Adagia* II viii 45, where Erasmus, quoting Plutarch, says that this was a proverb used in the city of Messene 'when of two things one is selected as more highly valued and more distinguished …' There were three ancient cities named Pylos, but the one associated with Nestor (king of Pylos in Homer's *Iliad*) was the most renowned.

3 The 'tragedy' that Erasmus feared was the victory of the Zwinglian Reformation in Basel, which would take place in January–February 1529.

4 Erasmus had sent Manrique an 'advance copy' of the apologia, advising him of his intention to publish it unless he recommended otherwise. Cf Ep 1888:3–5.

reach their destination. In addition, my copyists had more than enough to do and your letters arrived too late to have copies made.[5] I was compelled for these reasons to seek the help of printers, whose techniques produce two thousand copies more quickly than the efforts of my copyists can produce two. Froben guaranteed that he would deliver ten copies to me and put the rest aside so that they would not fall into anyone's hands without the express wish of your Excellency. If you were to order that they should not be published, he would suffer no loss, but all losses would be absorbed by me, who considered any expense to be of much less importance than the loss of your favour.

The terms of the agreement were observed in good faith until the unexpected death of Froben threw the whole family into such confusion that all cares were directed elsewhere and little precaution was taken in this matter.[6] Someone in Cologne succeeded through cunning in procuring a copy of the Froben edition and was making arrangements to have it printed. Such people are eager for gain, and they vie with one another far more passionately than potter against potter.[7] At this point, I had to decide not whether the book should be suppressed or not, but whether I preferred to issue a very faulty edition or one that was more correct. Constrained on both sides, I chose the lesser of two evils, allowing it to appear in a revised version. If your Excellency approves of this action, I shall be happy; if not, you will pardon me in your kindness and vent your wrath rather on necessity. I am so confident that this will be the case that I am afraid, knowing your readiness to forgive, that you may already be angry with me for having dwelt so long on a matter of such little importance.

Therefore it remains for me to appease my friends, who often berate me both in person and by letter for wasting good hours in responding to everyone's petty criticisms. There are some people who are born with the instinct to spread slander; then again there are many so eager for fame that they even envy Erostratus his reputation.[8] Who is so dull-witted that he cannot find something in another person's work that he can turn into a pretext for calumny? There is no quicker or shorter road to fame. There is yet another

* * * * *

5 Among these were Epp 1904, 1907–8, 1913, 1920, as well as the letter from Alonso Ruiz de Virués answered by Ep 1968 and two letters from Diego Gracián, Ep 1913 and another dated 9 January 1528.

6 Johann Froben died in October 1527.

7 *Adagia* I ii 25

8 He burned down the temple of Diana at Ephesus to establish eternal fame for himself.

class of people who use all their wiles and energy to create trouble for me and distract me from my studies. To reply to such people, they say, is to nourish their malice and return a good deed for an evil one. They bring forward a shameless calumny and win notoriety as their prize. This was the sum total of their ambitions. Thus my friends conclude that this whole race of rabble-rousers is to be completely ignored. No learned man deigns to read their insipid nonsense, and certainly posterity will ignore it.

To these remonstrations of my friends I have little to respond except to say that it was worthwhile to respond to some of my detractors. I did not respond to all of them; towards some I remained silent. To none did I not respond with a gentle touch, as they say, convinced that none of these disputes would survive into posterity.[9] I do not know if this will be so, but certainly that is my wish. I deeply regret that I deemed certain people worthy of a response. The pamphlet you speak of certainly contained nothing that merited a response,[10] and I would not even have deigned to read it except that the present situation in your country is such that these trifles would be a source of trouble not only for universities and learned men but also for the leading princes of the church and even for the sovereign power of the imperial majesty, and would bring great tumult to all of Spain and pose a stumbling block for the weak.

I come now to the matter of placating those with whom I am at odds, for they will perhaps claim that their reputation has been somewhat damaged by this publication. I shall first ask them that in their wisdom they should consider that, had it been in my power, no one was more interested in having this work suppressed than I. Second, since the nature of the case is such that it would be an act of impiety for me not to refute the charges, and since the intent of the accusation reveals the clear ignorance, or falsity, or malice of the accuser and cannot be refuted without doing harm to his own reputation, there can be no imputation of guilt against one who defends his innocence, but rather the entire burden of guilt lies with him who initiated the proceedings. If someone accused another of theft and dragged him back into court after he had been acquitted by the verdict of the judges, suing for damages because through the argument for the defence he was considered a calumniator, what would he hear from the judge? Simply this: 'Why did you bring a false

* * * * *

9 Cf *Adagia* I iv 27: *Molli brachio, levi brachio,* 'by which we signify work not taken seriously.'

10 Evidently a pamphlet listing the passages in Erasmus' works to which the monks objected

charge against him?' Who will give audience to someone seeking compensation from someone against whom he shot an arrow that rebounded from the other man's shield and put out his eye? Whatever wrong is involved here is to be ascribed not to the one who repelled the arrow but to the one who shot it. If there had been some probability of impiety, Christian moderation would have dictated that it should be subjected to discussion and the duty of pronouncing a verdict be reserved exclusively to the judges. But now, although there are so many calumnies in circulation, still they never stop making their claims, never cease their revellings, unless perhaps it is not to be accounted as slanderous to say: 'Erasmus impugns the divinity, the dignity, and the glory of Christ. Erasmus undermines the authority of Sacred Scripture.'

When I demonstrate the falsity of these and many other statements, I do not cast their accusations back at them but merely call it an impudent calumny. I could not use a milder term to describe it. And yet I do not mention names, although the ringleaders of this tumult are known to me in each case. I wish that I could have defended my innocence without damaging any other person's reputation, not because any polite treatment is owed to such unprincipled individuals, who have disregarded the opinions of learned and good men, scorned the authority of leading prelates, defied even the imperial majesty, and as a consequence have thrown Spain, a country that formerly enjoyed the greatest tranquility, into confusion by their disorderly uprisings, but rather because I see that people everywhere are more disposed to hate monks than is reasonable or expedient for the Christian religion. The only thing I have left to say is to beseech the reader not to judge everyone by the morals of a few and to attribute these disturbances to ignorance or false persuasion rather than to perversity, and I exhort those people themselves in the name of Christ to pursue Christ's work with Christian integrity.

They will say, 'We have committed nothing to print against you' – as if those articles were not disseminated everywhere, or as if it is not a much more serious offence to attack a person with the spoken word than in printed books. A printed book encounters its judges and gives the person under attack opportunity of responding, if he wishes, while it takes away from the aggressor the possibility of denial. But they have more power than a book since, dispersed in all the regions of the world, they never stop wagging their tongues in concert against their neighbor, among women, craftsmen, courtiers, soldiers; at banquets, in private conversations, in the sacred confessional, in carriages and on board ship, in public lectures, in private conversations, in sacred sermons, in the marketplace, in schools, courts, and monasteries – and no more shamelessly anywhere than among the ignorant (their biggest audience), and they spread their calumnies in Spanish, French, Polish, Hungarian, German. Since they do not understand these things, it is

very easy to deceive them, and my detractors say, 'With them Erasmus has no tongue: we are equipped with a great many tongues and have a great advantage over such a person. If we band together and stand firm with shameless effrontery, we will be sure to win and we will impale Erasmus with our tongues.' O what holy thoughts, worthy of Dominic and Francis! Here even those who advertise themselves with the title of Observants,[11] who at first crawled into their shells when Luther began his lawless rampaging, now play leading roles. Again and again I beg good and pious monks not to think that any of this pertains to them. Would that the unscrupulous behavior of these people permitted me to spare even the wicked who, just as they do not spare themselves, so they do more harm to their order than the most deadly enemy.

What example can I give now of the kind of thing they utter with those sacred tongues from those sacrosanct breasts? One of them in a crowded assembly said that there were some heretical things in the books of Erasmus.[12] As he stepped down from the pulpit, he was accosted by a certain learned man who was a pensionary in that city.[13] He was asked to produce a heretical passage. He answered that he had never read any books of Erasmus, that he had tried to read a work called the *Moria* but because of the abstruse style he was afraid that Erasmus might have fallen into some heresy.[14] Another person, in an effort to stir up the crowd, said that I had corrected the Magnificat. Asked at table what the correction was, he blurted out whatever came to his mind,[15] namely, that I had translated 'to Abraham and to his seeds.' When the book was brought forth, it was proved to be a blatant lie.[16] Another singularly unlearned learned doctor said in a sermon in my presence that those who corrected the Magnificat were guilty of the sin against the Holy Spirit, as were those who said that the preacher did not understand his subject, since

* * * * *

11 The Observants (or Observantines) were those members of the Franciscan Order who claimed to 'observe' exactly the Rule of St Francis, in contrast to the Conventuals, whom they regarded as too worldly and lax. In 1517 the Observants were formally separated from the Conventuals and declared to be the true order of St Francis.

12 The Franciscan Nicolas Bureau, suffragan bishop of Tournai

13 Frans van Cranevelt, then pensionary of the city of Bruges

14 Epp 1581 and 2045 also identify the book in question as the *Moria* (ie the *Praise of Folly*), but in other accounts of the incident Erasmus says that it was the *Paraphrases;* see Epp 1144:51, 1192:43, 1212:20–1.

15 Cf *Adagia* I v 73: *Quicquid in linguam venerit.* The identity of this accuser is unknown; see the earlier account of his groundless charge in Ep 948:99–107.

16 Cf Luke 1:55, where Erasmus translated correctly in the singular, 'et semini eius' ('to his seed'). LB VI 228B

the subjects of sermons are taken from Sacred Scripture.[17] I had said at table once that a certain member of the same order had misinterpreted the words of Peter, which he had taken for his theme. What I said was the absolute truth. Another loudly proclaimed that in the Lord's Prayer in the Gospel of Luke I had translated *peccata* [sins] instead of *debita* [debts], although this is the church's reading of that evangelist both in Greek and in Latin.[18]

What shall I say of the man who criticized me in a crowded lecture hall for entertaining irreligious ideas about a life of chastity,[19] but afterwards in a private conversation admitted that until then he had believed that a declamation was a church sermon and that celibacy was a virginal and angelic life.[20] What about the person who exultantly declared that I had erroneously written that Jerome did not lead a life of perpetual virginity, since he writes to Eustochium: 'For we not only extol virginity but we preserve it,' when for anyone who knows Latin *servare* in that context means 'to show how one can preserve it.' And even if the meaning of the Latin was not clear, the context itself and the tone of the language indicate it.[21]

I am embarrassed to mention the story about the person who, commenting on the passage in the *Enchiridion* where I praised the *germanam theologiam* of the apostles, which had subjugated the arrogance of philosophers and the sceptres of kings under the yoke of Christ, publicly proclaimed that I

* * * * *

17 Sebastian Craeys (d 1523), Carmelite of Antwerp

18 In all his editions of the New Testament, Erasmus agreed with the Vulgate in the use of *peccata* to translate Luke 11:14 and Matt 6:12. In the *Annotationes* of February 1527 he added notes on Matt 6:12 and Luke 11:14 in which he noted that neither Luke nor St Augustine makes any distinction between *debita* and *peccata.* Erasmus' accuser in this case may have been the preacher referred to in Epp 541:92–8 and 948:108–13.

19 An apparent reference to the Louvain theologian Jan Briart of Ath (Ep 670), who in 1519 had publicly denounced Erasmus' *Encomium matrimonii* as an impious challenge to the ideal of celibacy; see Ep 946 introduction. Erasmus responded with the *Apologia pro declamatione matrimonii* (CWE 71 86–95).

20 Briart had failed to understand that the *Encomium* was a *declamatio* and that *declamationes* were exercises whose purpose was 'to treat the argument from both sides, as for and against a tyrannicide, for and against an abductor,' or for and against celibacy. Erasmus also alleges that Briart, with his poor knowledge of Latin, had understood *coelibatus* to mean *vitam coelestem*, ie a heavenly way of life, rather than simply the state of being unmarried. Cf CWE 71 91–3.

21 Cf Jerome Ep 22.23. This story is told in more detail and with greater clarity in Epp 1858:531–55, 2045:192–203. At Ep 2045:192 Erasmus' accuser is identified as a Dominican. As suggested in Ep 1858 n56, he might have been Erasmus' old Louvain adversary, Vincentius Theoderici.

said there was not theology anywhere but in Germany, which was the greatest supporter of heretics. But even children know that the word *germanus* means 'true' or 'genuine,' and the word is used in that sense also in Paul, if that person had not read the classical authors.[22] Similar to this is the case of a great defender of the faith, as he thought of himself, who did not hesitate to accuse me before audiences of distinguished persons of saying to a Carthusian that it was better to eat meat than to suffer a slight headache, when I was reproving him for allowing his neighbor to put his life at stake because of a man-made vow.[23]

But I shall cease burdening your Excellency with these trivia, although they are not meant for you but for my adversaries. It is such things, and countless others more ignorant and stupid than these, that are spread abroad publicly before high-ranking men. What kind of rubbish should we imagine them whispering in secret? And yet these things reach the ears of sensible men – for we are not all fools or blockheads – and they pass them on to the crowd. And so it comes about that even without my uttering a word my adversaries win for themselves the derision or the hatred of many. Whenever they are induced by the authority of princes to restrain from these excesses, they say, 'We must obey God rather than men.'[24] This saying was perfectly appropriate for the apostles, who after imprisonment and floggings gladly endured for the name of Jesus, were ordered by the impious Jews to abstain from talking about what they had been commanded by Christ himself to preach throughout the whole world. But, when Christian and religious rulers restrain them from scurrilous abuse, from lying, from slander, from seditious outcries, how inappropriate is that saying, 'We must obey God rather than men'!

What is your purpose, my excellent friends? Is it by these methods that you think the church of Christ should be supported? Do you attempt to restore the authority of your orders by these stratagems? An authority that was

* * * * *

22 The passage in question is in the letter to Paul Volz that served as the preface to the 1518 edition of the *Enchiridion:* Ep 858:116–18 / CWE 66 10. For the use of the word by St Paul, see Phil 4:3 (Vulgate).

23 Cf *On Eating Meat* CWE 73 83. The accuser failed to understand that in the expression *in capitis venire discrimen* (to put his life at stake), Erasmus used the word *caput* (head) as a figure of speech (synecdoche) for one's whole life, particularly when it is threatened (as in the English expression 'capital punishment'); he mistakenly thought that Erasmus was arguing that 'a slight headache' (*levem capitis dolorem*) was a sufficient reason to ignore regulations of fasting and abstinence. This incident is recounted in more detail in Ep 1985:17–20.

24 Acts 5:29

never harmed by me, not even to the extent that any of you was deprived of an egg or a piece of cheese through my doing.[25] You cannot inflict more grave harm on it than you are now doing, believe me. I am not issuing threats against you. Consider what kind of world this is, reflect on what sentiments people have towards you. I shall not mention my prowess with the pen, or if I were to ally myself with those factions that are plotting the destruction of your orders. Perhaps I can gain permission from princes to plead my case in French or Spanish, which would only be just. But there is no danger that this will ever happen: you have in me a Jonah who would rather be thrown to the waves than be saved at risk of the common peril.[26] Plead your case yourselves with wisdom. If you do this, Christ will be present. If you persecute impious beliefs, no impious belief ever won my favour or ever will: in this you have me as your fellow soldier. If you are eager to repair and restore the authority of your orders, return to those virtues which procured so much authority and favour for your predecessors; and in this you will have Erasmus' applause. Let your defence be in Christ, whose glory must be served in all things. Through him you will conquer, if you fight under his auspices, and then you will truly gain a glorious victory, if you conquer for him. But if you turn your eyes away from Christ and place your hopes of victory in dishonesty, slander, cunning, outcries, whisperings, human favours, conspiratorial alliances, your plans will go astray and you will end up as the Jews did when they tried to obliterate the name of Christ and reinstate their former tyranny.

The gospel did not come down to earth from heaven to serve men's passions but to be a light to all men's ignorance, salt for their insipidity, an undeviating rule by which all actions of all men could be regulated. Let us stand firm on the solid rock so that through the rock we may conquer for the rock. Among men some are called powerful, others weak. In the presence of divine power we are all equally worms and gnats. No one is so powerful but that he can be pulverized if he should strike against this stone; no one is so weak but that he will be victorious if he will stand firm upon this rock.

I urge you to do this, my brothers. Indeed I should gladly give this advice to all Christians, so that they may bear in mind that this almost unheard of catastrophe of our time is the hand of the Almighty calling us to repentance. What evil is not present to us? War, pestilence, famine? We have

* * * * *

25 Erasmus liked to refer contemptuously to his adversaries in the mendicant orders, whose members were required to beg for alms, as *tyrologi* ('cheese collectors' or 'cheese connoisseurs'), a word of his invention that punned on *theologi.*

26 John 1:12

seen terrible things, and unless God looks after us we shall see things more terrible still. In the clash of opinions when was there ever greater ferocity, greater stubbornness? The Ninevites, terrified by the threats of the prophet, turned to repentance and obtained mercy from the Lord.[27] Pharaoh himself, tormented by frogs, locusts, horseflies and other calamities, cried to the Lord and found solace.[28] We have been afflicted with so many plagues for so many years, but I do not see anyone who thinks of changing his life for the better; everyone is eager to pluck some personal advantage from the public woe. One casts blame upon the other, everyone flatters himself. But if acknowledging together the hand of the Lord that has been extended against us, we would turn, each of us, to a reformed way of life with sincere hearts, the wrath of the judge would be turned to mercy and he would unite the minds of princes, would remove from us the armed locusts who spare nothing, sacred or profane, would drive away the croakings of sects, and the God of patience and consolation would grant us, according to Paul's prayer,[29] to live in harmony with one another in accordance with Jesus Christ, so that with one mind and with one voice we may honour the God and Father of our Lord, Jesus Christ, not torn apart but joined together and made whole in the same understanding and the same feeling.

At the present moment the Lord has confused the tongues of the earth, since we have erected a gigantic tower into the sky and thus we speak diverse things because each talks about matters pertaining to him.[30] Let us all conceive Christ in our minds and let us all speak of Christ with one mouth. Each one should remind himself of this, whether he be supreme pontiff or monarch or monk or prophet, for God has confined everything under the power of sin so that he may have mercy on all things,[31] and all of us are in need of the glory of God.[32] This evil is from the Lord; it is from him that we must seek a remedy. Why therefore do we not abandon the construction of Babel and instead dig wells so that we may find veins of tears by which the kindled wrath of the Godhead may be extinguished? While this duty pertains to all in common, it is especially incumbent on the monks, with whom the church once took refuge whenever the wrath of God pressed hard upon

* * * * *

27 John 3:10
28 Exod 8:1–32
29 Rom 15:5–6
30 Cf Gen 11:1–9.
31 Rom 11:32; Gal 3:22
32 Rom 3:23

it. It was they who by fasts, vigils, self-mortification, and prayers did not cease to call upon the mercy of the Lord until serenity returned. This is my advice, which, with Christ as my witness, I judge to be most salutary. If I had any better advice, I would gladly impart it.

But, most distinguished Bishop, almost forgetting to whom I am speaking, I have lingered too long on things that pertain to others. Therefore, I shall make an end of it, praying that Christ will bestow upon your illustrious Highness every blessing and good fortune.

At Basel, 14 March 1528

TO THE MOST REVEREND FATHER AND LORD IN CHRIST ALONSO MANRIQUE, ARCHBISHOP OF SEVILLE, INQUISITOR-GENERAL IN SPAIN IN MATTERS PERTAINING TO THE CATHOLIC FAITH, FROM DESIDERIUS ERASMUS OF ROTTERDAM, GREETING[33]

The apostle Paul, according to the testimony of Luke, was happy to be able to plead his cause before King Agrippa, since he was thoroughly acquainted with the Judaic customs, constitutions, and issues that were under discussion in that trial.[34] Confident, obviously, of his case, the saint desired nothing more than an intelligent judge, for the cause itself should win favour with an upright and equitable magistrate. I certainly could consider myself fortunate for the same reason, most honoured prelate, since the resolution of this rowdy dispute has fallen upon a judge distinguished no less for his learning and discernment than for his uprightness of life. But I am the more distressed that your piety, taken up with so many matters of grave concern, should have to deal with calumnies of this kind. Many will doubtless count it little loss that I am distracted and interrupted in my labours, in which I exert myself unceasingly to the best of my powers – indeed beyond my powers, both of age and of strength – for the advancement of good letters, which are already successfully flourishing among all nations, and for the restoration of the study of theology and the church Fathers.

The books I have written are in the public forum and can be enumerated easily enough; but to estimate how many sleepless vigils they cost me is very difficult. At present I am devoting all my energies to publish St Augustine in a complete and corrected edition worthy of his greatness, a work of immense labour and expense.[35] Scarcely anyone would believe how many monstrous errors I have detected in such an illustrious Doctor of the church, the result of either the ignorance of copyists or the temerity of would-be scholars. To raise a storm of protest against someone who gives freely of his efforts for the common good, in my opinion, will be seen by all sensible men as the worst kind of ingratitude. But to stab in the back with the sharp points of their tongues a fellow soldier – one who has adhered tenaciously to the Catholic side when the fortunes of the church hang in the balance as never before, engaging in hand-to-hand combat with the enemy – what name shall we give to such conduct? I leave it to others to devise a name; but in point of fact

* * * * *

33 The translation of this letter, Ep 1879, is by Charles Fantazzi, and the notes are by James Farge.

34 Acts 26:2–3

35 It appeared in ten volumes (Basel: Hieronymus Froben 1528–9).

nothing could have coincided more with the wishes of the one against whom these men profess to wage relentless warfare.[36]

But I should bear these evils, however great, more lightly if I were contending with Jews, as was Paul, or if the conflict were with heretics or pagans; for the victory would be a source of joy to all pious men and would harm or bring correction only to the impious. But in fact I am compelled to contend with men who profess to be pillars of the Christian religion, men who should both be paragons of virtue and be regarded as such. Of these two I would strongly wish to be included among the first and would by no means resent being included among the second if they themselves permitted. For those who are behind this, as I am given to understand, are not Jews, not heretics, not schismatics, not pagans, but Trinitarians, Dominicans, Franciscans, Carmelites, Augustinians, Benedictines,[37] names that have long enjoyed favour among all the nations of the world, who I should prefer should increase greatly in favour rather than suffer the least diminution.

Accordingly, since it is my only recourse, I pray Christ again and again that no one think that the stupidity or wickedness of a few has anything to do with the reputation of their orders. I should gladly put up with personal insult to protect their honour, if it were only a question of eloquence or native talent or learning; but no one should admit to the charge of impiety unless he was audacious enough to commit it. Indeed I shall not hesitate to ask the orders themselves that they keep this controversy private. In return I should like to caution all those there who are devoted to my cause to moderate their enthusiastic support lest a more violent clash of interests unleash some new discord in the world. There are more than enough disorders already in existence far and near, especially when we see that sometimes from the most insignificant beginnings very grave troubles arise, stirred up by men of no account but quelled only with great effort by the authority of princes. As far as my sentiments are concerned I should rather be thrown overboard with Jonah and ransom the public peace by the loss of my life alone than be called, if not the cause, the occasion of a deadly tempest.[38] And so I shall plead my case in such a way that, as far as possible, I leave my adversaries unharmed and unnamed. But should this affair seem to bring some reproach upon them, that is, if in the course of my defence the truth is laid bare, revealing them to be far from what they strive to appear, let them blame themselves,

* * * * *

36 Presumably a reference to Martin Luther
37 Epp 1805:145–6, 253–66, 1839:101, 1893 n13
38 John 1:12–15

not me, whom they have driven to this necessity. If they had dealt with me by private letter, the matter could have been settled without causing pain to anyone, and they would have won much favour in my eyes. But they conduct the affair not only publicly but also in an uncivil manner. I shall not bother to complain that for a long time now certain men have defiantly vented their frenzy upon my name, in public and in private, even in their sermons,[39] contrary to the wishes of pontiffs[40] and of the emperor,[41] providing an example completely alien to the teachings and practices of Dominic and Francis, whose names they use to promote themselves. How far removed from their professed purity of life is this document they have presented to your Excellency![42] First comes an exordium containing a roster of early heretics; this leads to an honorific mention of my name, as if Erasmus ever had anything to do with heretics. Then comes that formidable list of charges; is this any different from a formal indictment? And in the meantime the poison is spread generously everywhere.

But I shall not respond in like manner,[43] so that I may win the day no less by my moderation than by the merits of my case. I seek nothing more from your Excellency, most honoured prelate, than that in the midst of your numerous and pressing concerns you will not be averse to granting me a little time to become thoroughly informed about my case. For if there were any impiety in my writings, I am certain that in your piety you would never show me favour, nor would my conscience allow me to ask any favour other than correction, in the fervent desire that all impiety be as far removed from my writings as from my heart. I am well aware and confess that in my many works, some of which I wrote as a young man and some in a lighter vein and which I dashed off in haste rather than published – this is a defect of character – there are many things that could have been said more learnedly perhaps, or more cautiously, or with more moderation.[44] But I did not foresee this age of ours so prone to calumny. In any case no one, I believe, will find any impious content. If such could be demonstrated, I would be the

* * * * *

39 Epp 1805:38, 1858:443, 485, 1875:60
40 Cf Adrian VI, Ep 1805 n25 and Clement VII, nn77–8.
41 Eg Epp 1802:9, 1805:119
42 That is, the first list of articles (not extant) drawn up by the monks and communicated to Erasmus by Pedro Juan Olivar with Ep 1791. This was presumably the same document already rejected on 5 April by Manrique, who demanded that Erasmus' critics draft something more orderly and less repetitious. See Ep 1814 introduction.
43 Cf *Adagia* I i 35: 'To render like for like.'
44 Cf Epp 1828:18–19, 1902:296–7.

first juryman to use the black pebble,[45] the first magistrate to root out the error. But with such a diversity of temperaments, opinions, and judgments no one can satisfy all the suspicions and allegations, the perverse and distorted interpretations that arise on every side; and it makes no difference to do so, for even in the writing of the apostles calumny will find something to nibble away at, and no orthodox writer to this day has been so fortunate that he does not have to be read with some indulgence.[46] To mention only a few, in the writings of Roman pontiffs, in Jerome, and in Augustine there are things to be found that have a heretical meaning, pure and simple, if one were to dare profess them now.[47] There are certain human failings that a sense of equity condones in consideration of other merits. I myself should not wish to be condoned in that way.

But in these matters your judgment will serve as an oracle, excellent prelate, since your noble birth, holiness of life, goodness of nature, and singular learning preserve you completely free of any suspicion of ill will. But I am detaining you too long with this preface; I shall get to the point. First I shall cite faithfully the content of the document sent to me by the emperor's secretary.[48] The prologue is as follows:

* * * * *

45 A method of voting in which a white pebble signified acceptance or innocence and a black one rejection or guilt; see *Adagia* I v 53.

46 Cf Ep 1864 n16.

47 Erasmus disapproved of the lives and actions of a number of popes, but accusation of actual papal heresies is unusual. The most famous case of a papal 'heresy' was the private teaching of Pope John XXII (1316–34) that those who have died do not enjoy the beatific vision until the last judgment – an opinion denounced by the University of Paris and many theologians. He retracted it on his deathbed. In several places Erasmus cites Jerome's irascible nature and corruptions in the text of his writings, but we have not found in the *Hieronymi vita* or in the correspondence any passages in which he accuses Jerome of heresy. In Ep 1451:1530 Erasmus comments on Jerome's manner of response to those who accused him of heresy. Erasmus does, however, mention twice an example of heresy in Augustine (Ep 1877:198–201 and 290–2). In Ep 1858:69 he ironically terms Augustine 'the illustrious and completely orthodox author.' Augustine himself openly acknowledged and recanted errors in his works in his *Retractationum libri duo.*

48 This is the only time Erasmus mentions that Alfonso de Valdés had sent him the articles accusing him of heresy submitted by the Spanish theologians. They are probably different from the twenty-two articles (not extant) that Pedro Juan Olivar sent Erasmus on 13 March 1527, for in his letter Olivar writes that Valdés 'wants me to send him the articles that have been compiled against you' (Ep 1791:29–30). The articles Olivar sent antedate the ones presented by the 'monks' to Manrique on 28 March 1527, which he rejected as repetitive and disordered (Ep 1814:270–3).

PROEMIUM OF THE MONKS

Since according to the Apostle it is necessary, with God's leave, that there be heresies to try the faithful[49] and, as Jerome said, 'It is right that where there is continual bad growth, it should be continually cut off at the base,[50] when the weeds of heresies grew luxuriantly, the heavenly husbandman never failed to send workers into his harvest, that is, the holy church, on each occasion. And, not to speak of ancient heresies, rejected as false and eradicated by those luminaries of the church, Athanasius, Basil, Chrysostom, Augustine, Jerome and other divine workers, since in our day no few seeds of these weeds have grown up in their place and in many places have nearly suffocated the Lord's harvest, lest the kingdom of Spain suffer a similar fate, you have been sent, most pious Archbishop, to cut back, eradicate, and disperse these adulterated seeds, which some enemy has malevolently sown, with the divine and apostolic sickle of knowledge and with the aid of sanctity and the distinction of your noble line miraculously supporting you. Through your diligence and vigilant concern and apostolic precepts it has been brought about not only that the most learned men in the land and experts in the Sacred Scriptures should assemble before your renowned tribunal to treat of these very matters at your command and under your leadership, but also should draft a compendium of things in the writings of Erasmus that seemed in divers ways to be at variance with the true doctrine of the church. Therefore, after a cursory reading of some of the works of Erasmus as the constraints of time allowed, those things that were deemed worthy of your appraisal and examination are humbly presented and dedicated to you in this book in homage to your priestly authority.

* * * * *

49 1 Cor 11:19
50 Jerome *Praefatio in librum psalmorum* PL 29 123A

First Accusation: Against the Sacrosanct Trinity of God. Response of Erasmus to the First Article, or Rather Accusation

Whereas innumerable passages in my works profess candidly, clearly, and distinctly the teachings of the Catholic church concerning the Holy Trinity, that is, the equality of the divine nature in three Persons, or to express it more clearly, the same individual essence in three Persons, with distinct properties, not divided in nature; and whereas I so often express my loathing for the belief of the Arians, it seems to me a mark of singular impudence to charge me with the suspicion of such an execrable impiety as if I agreed with the Arians.[51] No one has ever before branded me with this charge, except for certain demagogues[52] born for slander and famed for nothing else, from whose writings, as it appears, these men have drawn their allegations.[53]

Perhaps it would be foolish, certainly it would be tiresome to rehearse here the passages proving the truth of what I say, since all my books, whether they be serious or playful, abound with this profession of faith, which is so recurrent, so clearly expounded, so vigorous that anyone could easily discern that I speak sincerely, especially since I do this so frequently where the subject matter did not require that I make this profession. If those who make these accusations did not read my works, they shamelessly censure what they do not know. But if they did read them and propagate these falsities, they make it sufficiently clear that they conduct this affair not out of zeal for piety, but driven by the disease of calumny. I thought this was an opinion so deeply rooted in the minds of all Christians that I never suspected that any Christian would rise up who would suspect otherwise of a fellow Christian. This attitude should explain any incautious word that might have fallen from my lips concerning the Holy Trinity, about which I never had any other opinion than what I have transmitted in my books, and there is no man who ever heard me speak ambiguously on this subject, although there is nothing more unpredictable than the human tongue, which in my case, at least, is more incautious in other matters than I would wish. Moreover,

* * * * *

51 The followers of Arius, a fourth-century cleric, who taught that Christ was created by the Father in time and was therefore a creature, not God. This doctrine was condemned by the councils of Nicaea (325) and Constantinople (381).

52 Erasmus uses the plural of the proper noun Hyperbolus, a fifth-century Athenian demagogue, who was frequently the butt of Greek comic poets. Aristophanes refers to him several times.

53 Erasmus must be referring to Edward Lee and Diego López Zúñiga.

although the mind of man is more fickle than the tongue, nevertheless this impious thought never occurred to me, not even in a dream.

1. In the *Paraphrase* that explains the first chapter of John,[54] when I give the reason why the divinity of Christ was not so clearly expressed in the books of the Old Testament nor so clearly preached at first by the apostles as the gospel of John expresses it, among other things I say the following: 'It could not have been taught immediately that there were three Persons distinct in particularity, each of whom was truly God and yet there was only one God because of the one divine nature equally shared among the three.' I think this profession concerning the Holy Trinity is Catholic beyond controversy.[55]

2. And a little further on: 'He (I speak of the Father) exists entire and eternal in himself, and as he himself is, so is the Son, forever being born from him, everlasting from everlasting, almighty from almighty, all-good from all-good; in short, God from God, not begotten later or inferior to his begetter, eternal Word of the eternal mind.'[56] What could be imagined clearer than these words?

3. A little before this are these words concerning the Son: 'Though in the meanwhile they were silent about the divine birth, whereby in an indescribable fashion he is born from the Father without a beginning, and they held back from openly calling him God, etc.'[57] Nothing can be born without a beginning except God from God.

4. Again a little before this in the same passage: 'They made known his divine nature in a way that was befitting for those times.'[58]

5. In the same passage: 'While some did not hesitate to take away from Jesus Christ the nature of his human body, substituting for a real man an empty ghost and illusion of a man, others, on the contrary, would deprive him of

* * * * *

54 The *Paraphrase on John* was first published by Erasmus in 1523, followed by three new editions in Erasmus' lifetime in 1524, 1534, and 1535.
55 John 1:1 LB VII 498B / CWE 46 14
56 John 1:2 LB VII 499C / CWE 46 16. The parenthetical 'I speak of the Father' is not in the *Paraphrase.*
57 LB VII 497E / CWE 46 14
58 Ibidem

his divine nature, falsely claiming that he came into existence only at the time when he was born of Mary, etc.'[59] You perceive here also that the divine nature is plainly attributed to Christ.

6. Further on: 'When the true God took on himself true man, so that both were the same thing, and at the same time nothing was taken away from his unchangeable divine nature, and the wholeness of his human nature remained intact.'[60]

7. Further: 'But the likeness of begetter and begotten, which in human begetting is imperfect in many ways, is utterly perfect in God the Father and his Son.'[61]

8. A little further on: 'Whatever has been created had a beginning in time, but the Son of God was born twice, once from his Father before all time, or rather without time, true God from true God, and again in time, etc.'[62]

9. And then of the Son of God I say this: 'He was of a nature undivided from the Father in such a way that he was with the Father in the particularity of his own Person; and he was not attached to the Father as accident is attached to substance, but he was God from God, God in God, God with God, because of the nature of the divinity common to both. There was no distinction between the two, who were equal in all things, except the particularity of begetter and begotten, of the one who utters and that which is uttered.'[63]

10. Further on: 'And although this word was God almighty from the almighty, nonetheless, distinguished by the particularity of person, not by a difference of nature, he was with God the Father.'[64]

11. Again: 'But through this word of his, coeternal with himself, the Father created all things that were created, etc.'[65] Nothing is coeternal with the Father except the Son and the Holy Spirit.

* * * * *

59 LB VII 498D / CWE 46 15
60 LB VII 498E / CWE 46 15
61 LB VII 499A / CWE 46 15
62 LB VII 499E–F / CWE 46 17
63 LB VII 500A / CWE 46 17
64 LB VII 500B / CWE 46 17
65 Ibidem

12. Again: 'Not like using a tool or a servant, but like using a son of the same nature and the same power.'[66]

13. Again: 'But through the Son, whom he had begotten from eternity equal to himself in all things, and will beget without end.'[67]

14. A little further on I speak of the Son: 'In fact, as he is the source of life for all things, so is he also the source of light, inasmuch as the Father through his eternal begetting pours into him the fullness of the divine nature.'[68]

15. Likewise after a considerable number of verses: 'Therefore the Son of God and God himself lowered himself to our lowliness.'[69]

16. Again a little further on: 'He continued to dwell in us, divinity clothed in human flesh.'[70]

17. Again towards the end of this chapter: 'For though the disciples, as in a daze, marvelled at something more than human in Christ, nonetheless they did not yet fully believe that the fullness of divinity was in him.'[71]

I have cited these numerous excerpts from the *Paraphrase* of one chapter, which I fear may already seem excessive, but in your piety, most distinguished Bishop, you will deign to hear patiently these and other things so that you will clearly perceive what kind of people are creating trouble for you and for me, and so that these words restore tranquility to your region, which at the present time is unsettled.

18. In the preface to Prince Ferdinand, brother of the Emperor I write: 'They think the chief reason for his writing this Gospel was to assert the divinity of Christ against the heresies which were already springing up like bad tares in the midst of a good crop.'[72]

* * * * *

66 Ibidem
67 Ibidem
68 LB VII 500D / CWE 46 18
69 LB VII 503B / CWE 46 22
70 LB VII 504A / CWE 46 23
71 LB VII 514A / CWE 46 37
72 CWE 46 11 (Dedicatory letter to the *Paraphrase,* Ep 1333:377–9). Erasmus goes on to say: 'in particular, those of the Cerinthians and the Ebionites, who apart from other errors taught that Christ had been nothing more than a man and had not

19. A little later on: 'It was of the first importance that his divine nature should not remain unknown.'[73]

20. And later: 'The earlier evangelists had scarcely touched on the divinity of the Lord Jesus.'[74]

21. Again, a little further on: 'And so it was the foolhardiness of heretics that drove the Apostle into more openly claiming divine nature for Christ, just as the boldness of the Arians drove the orthodox Fathers to give more precise definition to those same things.'[75]

22. So much from the *Paraphrase*. Now from the *Annotations* on this same chapter the first edition contained the following: 'It is the custom in Divine Scripture often to attribute the word God to the Father, although it belongs equally to all Persons, etc.'[76]

23. In the same place and in later passages we read: 'And God was the Word. In this passage the article is not added to God, although it signifies God truly and naturally. But he was forced to do this. Otherwise he could not explain at the same time the divine essence common to the three Persons.'[77]

24. A little further on: 'And the Word was made flesh. And yet the divine nature dwelt at the same time in the soul and in the body of Christ, not enclosed, but united, etc.'[78] Does this seem to be said obscurely?

* * * * *

existed at all before he was born of Mary.' The Cerinthians were the followers of Cerinthus, an early Gnostic of the first century from Asia Minor who taught that the world was not created by God, but by a demiurge, and that Jesus had begun his life as a mere man, but at his baptism Christ, a higher divine power, descended upon him. The Ebionites were a sect of Judaizing Christians who believed that Christ was the preordained Messiah, but not the Son of God by birth.

73 CWE 46 11 Preface to the *Paraphrase on John* (Ep 1333:389–90)

74 CWE 46 11 (Ep 1333:393–4)

75 CWE 46 12 (Ep 1333:402–5)

76 *Annotationes in Joannem* ASD VI-6 39 app crit. In the 1519 edition Erasmus added: 'even if it is clearly inferred from numerous passages that Christ was God, not merely man.'

77 ASD VI-6 38 177–9, 1522 edition. Erasmus explains this passage at great length in response to Lee CWE 72 172–5 / ASD IX-4 153–5:255–333.

78 ASD VI-6 48:422–4

25. The *Paraphrase on the Epistle to the Romans* towards the beginning has this: 'Who was born in time of the lineage of David according to the infirmity of the flesh, but was also revealed to be the eternal Son of the eternal God according to the Spirit which sanctifies all things, etc.'[79] Whoever declares that the Son of God is eternal denies that he is a creature, proclaiming that he is God. For it is agreed that nothing is unqualifiedly eternal except the divine nature.

26. Again the *Paraphrase* on chapter nine of the same Epistle, not far from the beginning, he says: 'But Christ is man in such a way that at the same time he is also God, governing all things, to whom alone is owed praise for all eternity. Amen.'[80]

27. And in the *Annotations,* discussing a variant reading of this passage and the diverse interpretation of the ancient writers, among other things I say this: 'The fact that elsewhere in Paul the word 'God' is usually attributed to the Father and 'Lord' to the Son is not because it is any less appropriate for the Son than for the Father but because it was more expedient for those times, etc.'[81] I beseech you, Christian reader, what could be said more plainly and more contrary to the Arians?

28. Again in John, chapter 20, towards the end, the *Paraphrase* reads as follows: 'When Thomas had seen and touched, recognizing both the face and the familiar voice of the Lord, now receiving full faith, he cried out: "My Lord and my God." For just as he had been rather reluctant to believe, so no one proclaimed more clearly the God and the man, etc.'[82]

29. The *Annotation* on this passage says: 'This is the one place in which the evangelist openly attributes the word 'God' to Christ, although apart from this there are innumerable proofs in the books of the Old Testament in which it is abundantly clear to pious minds that Christ was both God and man, etc.'[83]

* * * * *

79 Rom 1:3 LB VII 779B / CWE 42 15
80 Rom 9:5 LB VII 806D–E / CWE 42 53
81 Rom 9:5 *Annotationes in Romanos* ASD VI-7 229: app crit 1519–1527 editions
82 John 20:28 LB VII 645B / CWE 46 220
83 ASD VI-6 166:73–6

30. And lest some heretic should say that this was said by the disciple from an excessive enthusiasm for his teacher, the kind of blasphemy Porphyry[84] was accustomed to utter, I add, 'Christ acknowledged this statement of the disciple, but would certainly have rejected it if he had falsely been called God, especially in the hearing of the other disciples.'[85]

31. In addition the *Paraphrase on Philippians* 2 says this of Christ: 'And although he was by nature God and moreover by his very deeds demonstrated that he was God, etc.'[86]

32. In the *Annotations*, pointing out that this passage can be explained in two ways, I accept both readings because neither of them is at variance with Catholic doctrine. In the *Paraphrase*, however, I follow the one that contradicts the Arians.[87]

33. In the Epistle to the Romans, chapter 1, on this passage: 'From God the Father and my Lord Jesus Christ' the *Annotation* states: 'But in such a way that this form of expression detracts from neither the lordship of the Father nor from the deity of the Son. "Inasmuch as in the same way that the Father is Lord, and the Son is God, so also the Holy Spirit is called Lord, etc."'[88] Here with no concealment I attribute to all Persons equality in deity and domination.

* * * * *

84 Porphyry of Tyre (c. 232–303) was a learned philosopher and philologist, author of a book called *Against the Christians*, which exists only in fragments. Fiercely anti-Christian, he dismissed the gospels as the work of charlatans and denied the divinity of Christ.

85 ASD VI-6 166:80–1

86 Phil 2:6 LB VII 996B / CWE 43 371

87 ASD VI-9 288–90. The two ways he refers to are the different interpretations of the phrase 'thought it not robbery to be equal with God.' In the *Annotations* Erasmus says that this should be understood of Christ inasmuch as he is man, whereas the fathers of the church took it to mean according to the form of the deity. A theologian named Hieronymus Dungersheim at Leipzig wrote him a letter on 18 March 1517 (Ep 554), soon after the publication of the first edition, in which he expounds at great length on the traditional meaning of these words in a friendly manner. Erasmus did not reply.

88 Rom 1:7 ASD VI-7 58:478–80 / CWE 56 31. The passage is taken from Didymus *De Spiritu Sancto* 29 PG 39 1060A.

34. Again at John 14 the *Paraphrase* in the person of Jesus says: 'Therefore, since I am the image of the Father, like to him in every way, and since you ought to have known me by now from my deeds and by my words (since to have seen is to know), with what brashness do you say to me, "Show us the Father," as if whoever has seen me has not also seen my Father! Not that the Father is not another person than I, but that between the two of us there is no difference according to a higher nature, etc.'[89] How different is this tune from the Arians, who deny that the Son is in any way similar to the Father as regards divine nature!

35. Likewise, in John 10 concerning the words, 'The Father and I are one,' the *Paraphrase* includes both interpretations, viz., concerning the agreement of the will and the union of nature, saying: 'As there is a complete sharing of power between the Father and me, so there is entire agreement of will; we are completely one, equally powerful, willing and not willing the same thing, etc.'[90] Although some interpret this passage as concerning the concord and agreement of will, and believe that the evangelist seems to have understood this with arguments that are far from absurd, nevertheless I add the sharing of a common nature and the equality of power, which I certainly would not have done if I had agreed with the Arians.

36. Also at chapter 14 the *Paraphrase* has these words: 'We are three, but so joined that whoever loves one must necessarily love all; whoever possesses one lacks none, etc.'[91] Do I not profess here with sufficient clarity the same and the individual nature of the Persons?

37. Likewise at John 16 in the *Paraphrase* the Son speaks of the Holy Spirit in this way: 'Not because our power is not the same, but because it is best for the salvation of the human race that the parts of the task be divided into periods of time.'[92]

38. Again in the same place the Son says of the Father and the Holy Spirit: 'Among us there is nothing that is not common to all. All things proceed from the Father, but nothing is his that is not also mine, and nothing is the

* * * * *

89 John 14:9 LB VII 609B / CWE 46 170
90 John 10:30 LB VII 585EF / CWE 46 137
91 LB VII 612A / CWE 46 173
92 John 16:8 LB VII 620D / CWE 46 185

Father's or mine that is not shared with the Spirit.' In the same place, a little before that, the Son speaks of the Spirit: 'For he is not only all-powerful but also all-knowing.'[93]

39. Likewise at John 17, on the passage, 'That they shall acknowledge you as the only true God,' the *Annotation* says this: 'This passage more than any other provided the Arians with an opportunity for error, so that they could say that only the Father was truly and properly God, although the fact that he said 'only' does not exclude the Son, but separates the true God from the gods of the pagans, etc.'[94] I beseech you, reader, doesn't this annotation breathe a marvellous spirit of Arianism? Since I have Christ speak in the *Paraphrase* I was not able to give utterance to the same thing because Christ, before accomplishing the mystery of the passion, prepared the minds of his followers for the knowledge of the divine nature through certain signs, but never revealed this openly in words.

40. Concerning 1 Corinthians 6, towards the end, the *Paraphrase* in explanation of the words of the apostle, 'Do you not know that your members are the temple of the Holy Spirit?' speaks in this way: 'The body itself has also been so consecrated to God that it is the temple of the Holy Spirit.'[95] And a little later on: 'Do not dishonour him by defiling your bodies, but carry about with innocence of mind and chastity of body the divine presence that dwells in you, and shed your light upon men, etc.'[96] Although this passage can be explained differently, I follow this meaning, which is contrary to the belief of the Arians, since I call the Spirit a divinity.

41. In the First Epistle of John, chapter 5, the *Annotation*, glossing the passage 'And these three are one,' reads as follows: 'In the first place their conclusion that the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit have the same single and indivisible substance is completely true. If this were not so, the Son would not truly be born of the Father nor would the Holy Spirit truly proceed from the Father and the Son, as God from the substance of God, etc.'[97] What do you

* * * * *

93 John 16:14–15 LB VII 622B / CWE 46 188
94 John 17:3 ASD VI-6 150:747–9. Erasmus added this clause in 1527. One of the monks at Valladolid, Esteban de Almeida, quoted the 1522 version, in which Erasmus seems more lenient to the Arians.
95 1 Cor 6:19 LB VII 878A / CWE 43 85
96 LB VII 878B / CWE 43 85
97 1 John 5:7 ASD VI-10 550:377–81

say, reader? Do these things seem to be said ambiguously? Do they smack of Arianism? I don't think so.

42. In Matthew, chapter 16, the *Paraphrase* says this: 'Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God,' not proffering a suggestion, but confessing with certain and indubitable meaning that he was the Messiah promised by the prophets, in some unique way the Son of God.'[98] Here when I say that Christ in some unique way is the Son of God, obviously I confess that he is the Son by nature, according to which he is called the only begotten son. Otherwise he is said to have many brethren.

43. At Mark 11 the *Paraphrase* says: 'Furthermore since Christ had so moderated all his words and deeds that at one time he would reveal the proofs of his divine nature, at another time he would show the truth of his human nature, etc.'[99] Here also I profess that Christ is God and man.

44. At Luke 6 the *Paraphrase* says: 'For there was in him the source and plenitude of divine power.'[100] This cannot be said of any mere man. I do not doubt that there are innumerable passages in the *Paraphrases* that express the same meaning, but chance offered this one. There would have been many more if the dispensation of the preaching of the Gospel had not concealed the mystery in the Son and the Holy Spirit to suit the occasion, indicating it only in obscure wrappings. Since in the *Paraphrases* I had to cater to the people, it was fitting that I did not depart altogether from this dispensation.

45. In the 'Colloquy on Faith' there are these words: 'Do you believe that Jesus was God and man?' The answer is 'Certainly.'[101] Then a little further on: 'Do you believe in the Holy Spirit?' The answer is: 'I believe he is true God, together with the Father and the Son.'[102] Again, a little later: "Is the Son more like the Father than the Spirit?' The answer: 'Not with respect to the divine nature, etc.'[103] I attribute the divine nature equally to the three Persons in a sufficiently clear manner, I think. And these words are spoken there by a

* * * * *

98 Matt 16:16 LB VII 92E / CWE 45 245
99 These words are not found anywhere in the *Paraphrase on Mark.*
100 LB VII 346A / CWE 47 193
101 *Colloquia* ASD I-3 366:98–9 / CWE 39 424
102 ASD I-3 370:229–30 / CWE 39 428
103 ASD I-3 371:245–6 / CWE 39 428

person suspected of heresy,[104] but they are approved by a person of orthodox belief. The object of this colloquy was to show that when those who are called Lutherans agree with us in so many important articles they should likewise agree in others that are of less importance, although that second part was not added so that I would not irritate those whom I did not wish to irritate.

46. Likewise in the poem in which I teach the rudiments of the faith to young boys I speak of the Holy Spirit in this way:[105]

> In Thee as well with kindred faith, O Spirit Godhead, I believe,
> Sacred spiration and breath of God, illuminating all that is.[106]

47. Although in the Apostle's Creed the name of God is not expressly attributed to the Spirit, nevertheless, I call him Godhead (*numen*), which is more than if I had said God. Scripture uses the words God and men, Godhead never.

48. In the same poem are these verses:

> And this Trinity, holy and worthy of all praise,
> With all my heart, with all my mind,
> With all my strength will I obey and honour.
> This triune God will I revere and all my hope
> In him alone is fixed once and for all,
> By him alone will I appraise all things,
> Him alone for his own sake will I forever love.[107]

You see here how many things concerning adoration, hope, love for its own sake, supreme reverence I have attributed equally to the three Persons. And does one who inculcates such things into the minds of boys agree with the Arians?

* * * * *

104 In the fiction of the colloquy the person interrogated is named Barbatius, representing Luther himself or a Lutheran, while the inquisitor is named Aulus.

105 This poem is entitled *Christiani hominis institutum*, elementary instruction for the individual Christian, composed for use in St Paul's School in London. It was a translation into Latin verse of John Colet's English *Catechizon.*

106 CWE 85 94:19–20 / ASD I-7 182:19–20

107 CWE 85 100:66–71 / ASD I-7 185-6:66–71

49. At the beginning of the *Prayer to Jesus, Son of the Virgin,* are these words: 'From the Father, the source of all light, to whom you are joined in such a way by the incomprehensible bond of the Holy Spirit that neither the simplicity of the Monad confuses the distinctions of Persons nor does the particularity of the Triad divide the unity of the substance, etc.'[108] How clearly I attribute the same essence to the three Persons!

50. In the *Paean* I speak in this manner: 'You gave birth to God, heaven is amazed … You brought forth God, nature is stupefied … You gave birth to God … you are the mother of God, etc.'[109]

51. In the *Supplication to Mary* there are these words: 'There is nothing the Father cannot do, likewise there is nothing the Son cannot do, since he is born omnipotent from one who is omnipotent, etc.'[110] It is agreed that the word 'omnipotent' is applicable to no one except the divine nature.

52. In that same place: 'For it was with your awareness and consent that the Holy Spirit, that unique craftsman, brought to completion in the workshop of your womb a creation, threefold in nature, in a sacred triad, fashioning in an instant the perfectly pure body of your Son from a tiny drop of your virgin blood, while at the same time infusing that blessed soul, created *ex nihilo*, into organs which though mortal were completely free of impurities, joining divinity with the most limpid part of the soul, and in this way uniting clay, the principle of life, and God in such harmonious diversity and diversified harmony that though the natures did not merge they nevertheless came together to form the same single person.'[111]

53. In the *Homily on the Child Jesus* I speak of Jesus in this way: 'Who indeed in a manner we cannot express or even imagine is continually being

* * * * *

108 LB V 1210E / CWE 69 4. In 1499 Erasmus was the guest of Anna van Borssele, the lady of Veere, in the castle of Tournehem, between Calais and Saint-Omer, where he composed the *Prayer to Jesus, Son of the Virgin,* the *Paean in Honour of the Virgin Mother*, and *A Prayer of Supplication to Mary, the Virgin Mother*. The three prayers were presented to the young son of Anna van Borssele, Adolph of Burgundy.

109 LB V 1229AB / CWE 69 22–3

110 LB V 1235E / CWE 69 45

111 LB V 1236C / CWE 69 46–7

born, beyond time, God from God, in all things equal to his eternal and supreme parent.'[112]

54. In the commentary where I explain the first Psalm I speak of heretics in this way: 'The Arians went astray when they say that the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are not *homoousioi,* ie, of the same essence, etc.'[113]

55. I profess the same thing in the *Birthday Poem*,[114] the same thing in the *Expostulatory Poem*[115] in the person of Jesus. Among other things this verse is contained there:

> Since I, God, of God the Father was begotten.[116]

I say nothing different in the *Disquisition on the Fear and Weariness of God.*[117]

56. In the commentary where I explain the Second Psalm the words are these: 'The head of the whole church is Christ, supreme above all things, God blessed forever.'[118]

57. In the same place, a little further on: 'In order, however, that authority be given to the Father, with whom he shares all things in common, etc.'[119] If all things are shared in common with Christ except the prerogative of the particularity of the Father, he possesses both eternity and a common nature.

* * * * *

112 ASD V-7 172:46–7 / CWE 29 57
113 ASD V-2 41:236–7 / CWE 63 16–17
114 *De casa natalitia pueri Jesu* CWE 85 82:33–5 / ASD I-7 166:33–5
115 The full title of the poem is 'Expostulation of Jesus with mankind, perishing through its own fault.'
116 CWE 85 84:15 / ASD I-7 170:15
117 Erasmus does not cite any passages from this treatise since it treats almost exclusively of the human nature of Christ, specifically the agony in the garden of Gethsemane the night before he died. It is a very early work, first published in 1503, whose full title, in English translation, is 'A short debate concerning the distress, alarm, and sorrow of Jesus as the crucifixion drew nigh; and concerning the words in which he seemed to pray for deliverance from death: "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me."' CWE 70 13–67 / ASD V-7 189–278
118 ASD V-2 138:328–9 / CWE 63 122
119 ASD V-2 139:352–3 / CWE 63 123

58. Again, a little later: 'Who did not become a son by adoption, in the usual way, like so many others, but in a special and inexpressible way, etc.'[120] He who is called the Son of God by nature is the one and only.

59. And later: 'Thus the Son of God is always being born 'this day' of the Father, just as he is always coming from the Father.'[121]

60. Likewise, after several verses: 'So the Father in turn brought honour to the Son by the resurrection, not because it brought him some new honour, but because he began to enjoy also among men the honour that he always had with the Father.'[122]

61. Again, in commenting on the Fourth Psalm I speak thus about images and the true God: 'People were misguided to worship such things before the Gospel trumpet had sounded throughout the earth proclaiming that they worship one God, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, etc.'[123] Does one who calls the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit one God agree with the Arians?

62. In the same place, not far from the end I say: 'Since there is a perfect and everlasting accord between Christ and the Father, because they are one, etc.'[124] I give the reason why there is the greatest accord between the Father and the Son. There can be no greater accord since they are one, ie, of the same individual substance.

63. The *Complaint of Peace* says this at a certain point: 'Please note what a special sort of concord Christ asks for his followers: he did not say that they should be of one mind, but that they should be one, and not just in any way, but "as we are one," who are one and the same in the most perfect and inexpressible way.'[125] Is this to be in agreement with the Arians, or rather is it not utterly to reject their opinion?

* * * * *

120 ASD V-2 140:386–9 / CWE 63 124
121 ASD V-2 140:393–4 / CWE 63 124
122 ASD V-2 142:423–6 / CWE 63 126
123 ASD V-2 198:169–71 / CWE 63 181
124 ASD V-2 272:562–3 / CWE 63 271
125 John 17:21–2. *Querela pacis* ASD IV-2 72:275–7 / CWE 27 301

64. In the *Method of Theology* this is said of Christ: 'At one time he reveals proofs of his divine nature, as when he commands the winds, etc.; at another time, concealing his divine nature, he acts as a man.'[126]

65. Then, after two pages, in a special chapter and at great length I produce arguments for both natures of Christ, the divine and the human.[127]

66. In *Christian Matrimony* I say this: 'For that outward ceremony of union, etc … symbolizes the mutual affection of the couple, but also the mystical and ineffable cohesion of the divine and human nature.'[128]

67. And even more clearly in a previous passage: 'Above all, it represents that supreme mystery, to be adored even by the angels,[129] whereby the divine nature so joined itself to human nature by an ineffable bond that in one and the same hypostasis the Son of God, a human soul and a human body, were joined.'[130]

68. And a little further on: 'The agent of conception was the Holy Spirit, the new-born child was God and man.'[131]

69. Again, in the same place: 'And for that reason they call it the joining of man and God in the hypostasis of Christ.'[132]

70. In the *Apology to Lefèvre d'Étaples* are these words: 'For what degree of majesty could be added to one who is always equal to the Father; or how could he be diminished whose divinity lost nothing and whose humanity was even raised up?'[133]

* * * * *

126 *Ratio vel Methodus compendio perveniendi ad veram theologiam* ed Hajo and Annemarie Holborn (Munich 1933) 211:32–5
127 Ibidem 215–23
128 ASD V-6 78:420–3 / CWE 69 233
129 Heb 1:6
130 ASD V-6 70:254–6 / CWE 69 226
131 ASD V-6 76:375 / CWE 69 230
132 ASD V-6 70:265–6 / CWE 69 233
133 ASD IX-3 136:1286–8 / CWE 83 54. James Farge remarks on this passage in the first draft of the *Apology* sent to Manrique de Lara that one of the hallmarks of this work is Erasmus' emphasis on the humanity of Christ vis-à-vis Lefèvre's more 'sublime' insistence on Christ's divinity. Ep 1877 n31

71. In that same work: 'Jesus Christ is one person, the same as God and as man, and while he has certain attributes by reason of his divine nature and certain others by reason of his human nature, yet they are predicated of him under either title because of the hypostatic union, so that he may rightly be called God when he is said to have died, and similarly may be called man when he is said to be equal to God the Father.'[134] Here I evidently attribute to Christ equality with the Father. And elsewhere professing the identity of essence, I reject proportion of identity. But statements of this kind are found so frequently in that disputation that it would be boring to present them one by one.[135]

72. In the *Preface to Hilary* this is said: 'In which [ie, the Scriptures], though the name of God is assigned several times to the Son, yet nowhere is it explicitly assigned to the Holy Spirit, even if the devout probing of orthodox believers later ascertained with sufficient proof from the Sacred Scriptures that whatever was attributed to the Son was appropriate to the Holy Spirit, except for the individuality of Persons.'[136]

73. Likewise, a little further on, concerning the equality of the Persons I say: 'And these remarks of mine are not meant to call into question what the authority of the orthodox fathers has handed down to us from the Divine Scriptures.'[137]

74. Responding to an annotation of Edward Lee, number 22 among the new annotations, I say: 'The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are wise, and yet it is the same wisdom; all three will, and yet it is the same will; all three foresee, and yet it is the same providence. They are three and yet their essence is the same.'[138] I ask you, what could be said more clearly? Responding to annotation 71 of the same person I say: 'There is no controversy between Lee and me about the matter, nor have I have ever written or held an opinion

* * * * *

134 ASD IX-3 108:589–94 / CWE 83 26–7
135 Guy Bedouelle aptly comments: 'This is what Christology calls the "exchange of ideas" (*communicatio idiomatum*). In theological and liturgical terms one can speak of either divine or human attributes when referring to Christ, the Incarnate Word.' CWE 83 27 n96
136 Ep 1334:450–5
137 Ep 1334:469–70
138 ASD IX-4 319:43–5 / CWE 72 399

about the single and simple essence of the three Persons that differs from orthodox belief.'[139]

75. And in that same place I teach that there is the same divine nature in the three Persons just as the same entire soul is present in the individual members of the body, since it is a simple and individual form, but the divine nature is much more simple.[140]

76. In the commentary in which I explain the poem of Prudentius on the Epiphany of the Lord to the daughters of the eminent gentleman Thomas More, I say: 'Threefold nature. In the hypostasis of Christ there were three substances or natures: his divine nature, his human soul, and his human body.'[141]

77. Again in the *Poem on the Birthday of Jesus* [of Prudentius] I speak in this way: 'Thus the word of God before the creation of the world, always being born from the heart of the Father and never leaving it, was wisdom, etc.'[142] That which is born from God cannot but be true God.

78. Again in another place: 'According to it [the nativity], which is inconceivable to man, he is constantly being born from the Father without beginning or end, and has always been born, God from God, omnipotent from omnipotent.'[143]

79. Again, a little further on: Thus the Father produces the Son, without being anterior to the Son'[144] [ibidem].

80. Again, a little before that: 'He is always being born from the Father, like an eternal ray from the everlasting sun, etc.'[145] These views differ diametrically from the belief of the Arians.

* * * * *

139 ASD IX-4 155–6:337–9 / CWE 72 175–6
140 ASD IX-4 156:365–6 / CWE 72 177
141 ASD V-7 344:217–9 / CWE 29 205
142 ASD V-7 321:182–3 / CWE 29 180
143 ASD V-7 320:151–3 / CWE 29 179
144 ASD V-7 320:158–9 / CWE 29 179
145 ASD V-7 318:75–6 / CWE 29 176

Since my writings proliferate with statements of this kind, those which I wrote as an adolescent, as a young man, as an old man, in jest and in earnest, those who make these accusations either did not read my writings, or if they did read them, spread calumny against their neighbor contrary to their own conscience. I have no doubt that hundreds of other passages besides those that I have enumerated can be found in my writings, if anyone searches them out. I have merely cited these from memory on the spur of the moment, conjecturing where mention of such subjects might be found. I regret that in answering such shameless calumnies I often lose good hours that should be spent on better things. And does not one who never ceases to inculcate and impress these things into the minds of boys, old men, men, and women, deserve to be suspected of the heresy of the Arians? Nothing is easier than to concoct calumny, but it is not so easy to dispel it. I am not unaware that they do this to distract me by these annoyances from fruitful labours or to push me into the Lutheran camp, although their efforts are in vain, for I shall never either out of hatred or in favour of anyone depart from the community of the church. Idleness, numerical strength, and impunity incite them to this impudent aggressiveness. After the calumny has been repelled by the applause of gods and men, as they say,[146] they are quiet for a while and they are called zealots and enjoy their maliciousness because they have exposed to scorn the one whom they disliked, and though defeated have triumphed. But this is for another time; in the meantime they must use strong arguments to convince people that Erasmus, in filling his works with such words, had blasphemous ideas about the Holy Trinity. Therefore, let us hear what they bring forward. There is no doubt that they wished to put their strongest charge of calumny on the front line of the battle.

Against the Sacrosanct Trinity of God.
First Article of the First Chapter.

OBJECTION 1. 'In his *Annotations* on the First Epistle of John, chapter 5, Erasmus vehemently defends corrupt manuscripts. He vents his fury against the blessed Jerome. He pleads and defends the cause of the Arians. For he impugns with inexorable hostility the passage: "There are three who bear testimony in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, and these three are one," and he repudiates all supporting evidence, heaps up frivolous reasons to the contrary from all sources, and attacks St Jerome in these

* * * * *

146 *Adagia* I i 74

words: "Although he, ie, Jerome, is often impetuous, unrestrained, wavering and inconsistent."'[147] These are his words.

RESPONSE 1. Now to the first article, if these can really be called articles and not rather insolent calumnies excerpted from a list of some calumniator. First of all, the title itself announces the theme of the argument: 'Against the sacrosanct Trinity of God.' Who would not shudder at such a title? This is to pronounce a verdict, not to lay a charge. But they were allowed to present articles to the Most Reverend Archbishop of Seville without recourse to vilification, not to reveal their prejudice with insulting language against the judge and me. Yet I do not imagine that they think the judge is so dull-witted that he will be influenced by these titles. But they spread them among the simple-minded who read nothing but the titles, and even if they read them, they have no judgment. But at the same time they have not kept in mind that the world has been roused from its lethargy, to such an extent that even idiots and simple women have some shrewdness of judgment. Who does not see that this has been copied from a written catalogue? 'Erasmus defends corrupt manuscripts; he vents his fury against the blessed Jerome; he pleads and defends the cause of the Arians; he impugns with inexorable hostility the passage on the Trinity; he repudiates all supporting evidence; he heaps up frivolous reasons to the contrary from all sources, etc.' I recognize it, I recognize the language of the person, and soon he will be treated as he deserves, since he does not know when to stop.[148]

And yet it is the mark of a legitimate investigator first to quote the words, just as they are, that he considers to contain some impiety, then in a few words to present what is offensive in these words. If they do not know this, let them read the articles of the Parisian theologians, both those that they published in the past and those that they recently published against Luther; let them read the articles of the schools of Cologne and Louvain; let them read the articles of the bull issued by Leo X against Luther.[149] But if they present these verdicts and opinions out of their own head, it is up to them to prove what they assert, not my duty to plead my cause. As far as the first part of their calumny is concerned, I never knowingly defend corrupt

* * * * *

147 ASD VI-10 542:291–2

148 Erasmus believed that the monks had used new writings of Edward Lee in compiling their accusations.

149 *Exsurge, Domine*, 15 June 1520, promulgated by Leo X in answer to Luther's 95 theses and subsequent writings, threatening him with excommunication

manuscripts, but I transmit in good faith what I find in Greek manuscripts to Latin ears, without any harm done to the Vulgate reading, as far as I am concerned, and in the annotation I indicate which reading seems authentic to me, deferring judgment to the church, which I have done in every case to the present day.

But what does this have to do with the matter of the Holy Trinity? Will it not be possible to believe this doctrine if this passage is not in the Sacred Scriptures? And yet it was the Greeks especially who were at war with the Arians, but none of them, as far as I have been able to discover, introduces this testimony. It was not a question of whether the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit were of the same essence, for I was always and everywhere in accord with those who deleted this passage; what was being debated was which reading was that of apostolic truth, ours, which we now commonly use, or that of the Greeks. In the *Paraphrase* I follow the current reading of the Latin manuscripts. In the *Annotations,* however, I inform the reader which reading I prefer, adducing numerous proofs for my preference. If anyone wishes to know these, he may read my response to the annotation of Lee, twenty-fifth among the new annotations;[150] he may read the answer I later sent to Zúñiga, who misrepresents that same passage;[151] he may read what I answered recently to a certain reckless rabble-rouser, which was added to a life of the martyr Babylas, written by Chrysostom in Greek;[152] finally, he may read my comment on this passage in the *Annotations*, especially the fourth edition, which appeared in 1527.[153] For what purpose should I repeat these same things so often? If this passage was not in the Latin manuscripts, from what source did Jerome restore it? From the Greek? Yet it is more probable that it was absent from the emended Greek manuscripts. Otherwise if this testimony had been removed, by whom was it removed? Obviously by the Arians. But how was it possible for the Arians to corrupt all the manuscripts, even those of orthodox Greeks? But if the Greek manuscripts had this reading and it was useful against the Arians, why did none of those who open-

* * * * *

150 *Apologia qua respondet duabus invectivis Eduardi Lei* ASD IX-4 323–8 / CWE 72 403–11

151 ASD IX-2 252–8:447–544

152 At the end of Erasmus' Greek edition of St John Chrysostom's *De Babyla martyre* Froben printed an *Epistola in tyrologum quendam impudentissimum calumniatorem* (*tyrologus* is a Greek coinage of Erasmus meaning a 'cheese expert,' a pun on the word *theologus*). It is a defence of Erasmus' theology of the Holy Spirit, later published as Ep 1858 to Robert Aldridge.

153 This edition, published in March 1527, is considerably amplified. It is doubtful whether any of the monks at the Valladolid assembly, convened in August 1527, had access to it.

ly fight against the Arians produce this passage? Neither Athanasius in his books *On the Trinity* or in his letters, in which he affirms the divine nature of the Holy Spirit; nor Didymus[154] in the three volumes in which he does not omit anything from the Sacred Scriptures to prove that the Holy Spirit is of the same substance as the Father and the Son; nor Nazianzus writing overtly about the Holy Spirit;[155] nor Chrysostom so often waging war against their heresy; nor Theophylact, Chrysostom's slavish imitator; nor Cyril, especially in the work entitled *Thesaurus*,[156] where in the next-to-the-last chapter of the fourth book[157] he refers to this passage of John, but does not add the testimony of the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit; nor Ambrose in the books he wrote on the Holy Spirit in imitation of Didymus;[158] nor Hilary; nor does Augustine ever use this testimony, at least as far as I can remember, in disputing with the Arians. His commentaries up to this part of the Epistle are extant, the rest is missing. I have seen a very old commentary, written on parchment, of Bede, who reduced these Epistles into a compendium, in which the testimony concerning the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit was written in the margin,[159] but in a more recent hand, from which it must probably be conjectured that this testimony was not in Augustine.

I do not quite understand what is the aim of those who contend that this passage is necessary to prove the one undivided nature of the three Persons. If they admit that this is proved in many other passages, nothing would be taken away from the faith even if this passage did not exist. If it cannot be demonstrated from other sources, so many doctors of the church who fought against the Arians without the help of this passage had no effect.

* * * * *

154 Didymus of Alexandria (c 313–98), called 'the Blind,' was appointed by Athanasius as head of the cathedral school of Alexandria. He was deeply influenced by Origen. His treatise *De Spiritu Sancto* is preserved only in Jerome's Latin translation.

155 Gregory of Nazianzus *Oratio theologica* 5 PG 36 133–71

156 Cyril of Alexandria *Thesaurus de sancta et consubstantiali trinitate*, translated into Latin by George of Trebizond as *Praeclarum opus … quod Thesaurus nuncupatur … et De consubstantialitate Filii et Spiritus Sancti cum Deo patre*, edited by Josse Clichtove (Paris 1514). This is the edition presumably used by Erasmus.

157 Actually book 14, PG 75 615

158 Ambrose *De Spiritu Sancto* PL 16 697–816. In his translation of Didymus' work on the Holy Spirit Jerome accuses Ambrose of plagiarism and calls his work 'a bad Latin version of a good Greek text,' *Praefatio in librum Didymi Alexandrini de Spiritu Sancto* PL 23 108A.

159 This manuscript from the library of the Franciscan Minorites of Antwerp was made available to Erasmus. The passage occurs at Bede *Comm in Joan* PL 93 114B–D.

God forbid that we make such a crisis of so great a dogma of the church that it would be very plainly in danger of collapse if someone could show that this passage is not part of apostolic truth. Indeed, although a single passage of Sacred Scripture is abundantly sufficient for the certitude of our faith, the Arians would not be better off, even if this phrase were not in the text, since Athanasius, Didymus, and Cyril, besides many others, demonstrate the same nature of the three Persons with so many proofs from the Scriptures and so many arguments.

Nor do I see why the Arians thought that this phrase should be deleted although they did not delete 'I and the Father are one.'[160] But let them interpret that as referring to unity of will,[161] which they would do with much greater probability since from the context itself and from the interpretation of orthodox Greeks this passage refers to the testimony of the Father's voice when the Son was baptized, and the testimony of the Spirit, which descended upon him in the form of a dove, and the preaching, death, and resurrection of the Son. Although this interpretation does not contradict the equality of the three Persons, nevertheless, a heretic cannot be refuted by the passage since the previous testimony of the blood, water, and Spirit cannot refer to the same essence.

Further, I do not think it inappropriate to examine the arguments that the ancient writers used against heretics, among which there are some that have more influence through their number rather than their validity, and those that are of no effect with the recalcitrant do have effect with those who are ready to listen. If this is not permitted, why is it done daily in theological diatribes? By this method the Catholic faith is not subverted, but strengthened. But if someone should object that scandal should have been avoided, I did not write these things for the common people but that they be read privately by Scholastics, and I would not even have done this except that a certain calumniator had driven me to it. In the first edition of the New Testament, which appeared in 1516, I merely made this annotation on this passage: 'In the Greek manuscript I find only this on the triple testimony: "Since there are three who give testimony, the Spirit, the water, and the blood,"'[162] neither preferring the Greek reading nor criticizing ours. Moreover, in later editions I defer judgment on this passage to the church, to whom I shall always subject my interpretation as soon as I hear her clear voice.[163] For Jerome alone is not the church, and the church does not condemn immediately one who

* * * * *

160 John 10:30
161 Ie 'rather than being of one substance.' Cf ASD IX-4 327:300 / CWE 72 409.
162 ASD VI-10 540:252–4
163 ASD VI-10 550:401–2

in some places is doubtful about the genuineness of a reading, when the manuscripts differ among themselves and when not infrequently orthodox readers both introduce and interpret a threefold reading. This has always been done among men of learning and continues to be done, with no detriment to the faith. Some things the church prescribes, some she approves as plausible, some she tolerates, to some she deliberately turns a blind eye. The church public recites the story of Susanna and Bel; she daily sings the hymn of the three boys, which Jerome brands as apocryphal.[164] She recites the lives of the saints, writings of men, which it is not automatically an act of impiety to doubt. These are my words in the *Annotations*: 'It is a pious act to submit our judgment to the church as soon as we have heard her clear opinion.'[165]

I never discuss this passage without testifying that what these men conclude, viz., that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit have the same essence, is very true, so that no one will suspect some impiety. And if any scandal arises from this, it comes from those who heap up calumnies from nothing and make public things that should be discussed among men of learning.

Lastly, I have restored the testimony of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit in the last edition from an English manuscript, but it is a recent manuscript.[166] I have also found some Greek manuscripts that were changed to accord with the Latin reading. This was done since the time a treaty was made between the Roman and the Greek church. But we chose to follow a different reading so that we could indicate the reading of the orthodox Greeks whose commentaries we have, because their detailed commentary often does not agree with what we read.

Therefore, who does not perceive how many things this book has amassed in this one article in an exaggerated, not to say deceitful manner? It declares that the Greek passage is corrupt, which I have shown is not plausible. It declares that I plead the cause of the Arians although I openly profess what the Arians deny; and since this passage is not effective against the Arians unless whenever several things are declared to be one it can only mean that it is the same individual substance. I do not impugn the

* * * * *

164 The stories of Susanna and Bel are contained in Daniel, chapters 14 and 13, respectively; the hymn sung by the three boys, Sidrach, Misach, and Abdenago, is in Dan 3:52–87. Jerome refers to all three as apocryphal in *Praefatio Hieronymi in Danielem prophetam* PL 28 1293.

165 ASD VI-10 550:252–4

166 This was the Codex Montfortianus (see n21 above), which seems to have been made to order for him. Cf Henk Jan de Jonge 'Erasmus and the Comma Johanneum' *Ephemerides theologicales lovanienses* 56 (1980) 386.

testimony with inexorable hostility, as they claim, but I indicate what was written in the Greek manuscripts, of which I had a copy. Neither do I make my case with frivolous arguments, but with very serious manuscripts, as far as that is possible in a conjectural matter.

Then, who was ever said to vent fury on a person with whom he simply has a difference of opinion? Otherwise, who has never vented his fury against another? The orthodox doctors frequently disagree with themselves, not only with one another, and will I not be allowed to disagree with Jerome? There are many things in the New Testament which Jerome indicated were left over as a residue, as I have pointed out in many places. What inappropriateness is there if this one passage is left over which he did not wish to be left out? Who ever praised Jerome more fervently than I? Who paid him so much tribute? They will say, 'It is permitted to disagree, but with more respect.' As if we do not daily hear these comments from modern theologians: 'Jerome was not a theologian. He was a good father of the church. He was a rhetorician, not a philosopher.' What is more insulting than to deny Jerome the science of theology? And recently a Paris theologian wrote in this vein: 'If Jerome were living now and were to say that something must be corrected in the Bible, we would answer, "Be quiet, good father, you are speaking deliriously."' Another theologian, a Carmelite, when challenged at a banquet of very distinguished men about a citation from Augustine, flatly denied that it had been written by him until the manuscript was brought forth proving the man's impudent obstinacy. Then, when he was asked what he had to say, he replied, 'I say that Augustine lied.' Is this the respect shown by those who accuse me of blasphemy because I consider Jerome a human being like the rest of us? They forgive themselves for this, but now, when they seek an opportunity for calumny, the authority of Jerome is sacrosanct.

Further, when I say that Jerome is often impetuous, ie, that he twists Scripture, that he does not show restraint, that he is often wavering and not very consistent, I have shown that this is not without foundation in my response to Lee, citing many passages, and I could cite many more if necessary, if I did not prefer to protect the security of his authority. I was under the pressure of his authority and yet when I was forced to disagree with his authority I did so without being stubborn or intemperate and with a respectful preface. In my response to Lee I use these words: 'And certainly in matters of this kind that most holy man is quite passionate and vehement, not to say impetuous, etc.'[167] In the *Annotation* I say: 'But we are hard pressed by the

* * * * *

167 ASD IX-4 323:170–2 / CWE 72 404

authority of Jerome, which I would not wish to disparage, although often he etc… [168] But these clever manipulators excerpted what was somewhat harsh taken by itself, leaving out the things that mitigate the harshness of the disagreement, and claim that I do nothing less than vent my fury against such a man, whose holiness I venerate and whose learning I admire in all my writings. But he was a man, and he did not wish his books to be regarded as divine. There are some opinions in the books of Jerome and Augustine which, if one wished now to inspect closely, would be considered heretical. No one exposes these to view out of honour to these men. But if someone were to make an effort to defend his error by their authority, their judgment would be openly rejected, and if some scandal resulted, the fault would be imputed not to the one who rejects it, but to the one who attempts to defend it.

If what I said is true, I cannot be convicted of want of judgment. If I have been driven to this position through the calumny of my enemies, if I have mitigated the harshness of my disagreement, how can I be said to vent my fury? It is rather they who vent their fury against their neighbour when they impudently make such charges.

Second Article of the First Chapter

OBJECTION 2. 'And a little after this the same Erasmus said in favour of the Arians: "Perhaps it would have been better that the aim of pious studies be to become one with God rather than to dispute in elaborate studies how the Son differs from the Father or how the Holy Spirit differs from both. Certainly I do not see how what the Arians deny can be demonstrated except by speculative reasoning. Finally, since this whole passage is obscure, it cannot have much effect in refuting heretics."[169] Erasmus was heavily criticized and censured by many for this statement made in the most recent edition of the *Annotations*.'

RESPONSE 2. I do not know what their suspicions are here. For, as I have shown previously that I professed openly, clearly, and expressly that the three Persons are distinct in their particular properties, not in their essence, I do not think they suspect me of agreeing with Sabellian heretics,[170] unless I am

* * * * *

168 ASD VI-10 542:390–2

169 ASD VI-10 544:330–4

170 The Sabellian heresy, named from Sabellius, a theologian of the third century, was also known as modalism. It denied the Trinity, saying that there are not three distinct persons, but three different modes or aspects of one monadic God.

mistaken, or the Noetians,[171] who say that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are not distinct except in name. For the error of these heretics is diametrically opposed to the Arian error. The former teach that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit not only are the same thing but also the same Person, confusing the Persons, which the latter distinguish too much, separating the Son and the Holy Spirit from the communion of the divine nature and reducing them to the rank of creatures. How then is it consistent that they make Sabellius and Arius the same person? What was my purpose in making that admonition? I wanted to make it fixed and certain that through hyper-subtle argumentation we fall into doubt. That is what happened to the Arians, and perhaps today those who with the aid of philosophy try to penetrate more deeply into the inner sanctum of this mystery sense the danger of mental uncertainty and are forced to turn investigation into religion, and what they had begun to lose through their inquiries they preserve by their reverence. Is not the giver of this advice a staunch supporter of the Arians? Or rather does he not do this to prevent people from becoming Arians, discouraging them from what had once seduced the Arians? Yet I do not condemn investigation, but rather the subtle and contentious questions about this subject matter, which angelic minds worship rather than understand. And into this inner sanctuary puny men break in, relying on human philosophy.

If at this point anyone wishes to know what kind of discussions are carried on by certain people on the distinctions of Persons and on the divine essence, not to put him off any longer, let him read what the Scholastic doctors – Thomists, Albertists, Occamists, Scotists, nominalists and realists – and others, by whatever name they are called, have handed down in Book I of the *Sentences,* dist. 26,[172] on the relations of origin, on absolute properties, on Persons really but not essentially distinct, on the real and absolute relations of origin, on relations under the category of relations or under some other category, and whether the relation of origin is formally infinite.[173] Or when

* * * * *

171 The Noetians were followers of Noetus (c 200), a native of Smyrna, who taught that it was God the Father who in the Incarnation was born, suffered, and died.

172 Peter Lombard *Sentences* I *The Mystery of the Trinity* trans Giulio Silano (Toronto 2007) 163–70. James Farge reminds us that he did not complete the *Sentences* until c 1158 and therefore Scholastic doctors like Aquinas, Bonaventure, Scotus, and Ockham do not figure in it, Ep 1877 n53. The first of the four books is devoted to the Trinity and the divine essence. Distinctions 25 and 26 deal with the topics discussed here. Erasmus is of course mocking the language of Scholasticism.

173 A relation in Scholastic philosophy is a way of signifying several things that happen to have certain qualities with respect to which they resemble each other.

the relation of origin is removed, whether the Person of the Father can remain constituted and distinct. Whether it is valid that when compared to its opposite a relation is a thing, and whether when it is compared to essence it is only a method. Likewise, about instants,[174] incircumcessions,[175] and other things even more complicated I will leave it to others to see what they have to do with Christian piety. I for one do not know, especially when the opinions of those who treat of such subjects are not in agreement. I think my advice is pious and religious, and yet in order not to give the impression that I was condemning the investigations of the Scholastics observe how in so many ways I softened my admonition. First I say 'perhaps' so that I may not seem to be making an assertion, and I make it possible for whoever so wishes to disagree with me. Moreover, I do not say that investigation is bad, but I indicate what pertains more properly to the realm of Christian piety, that which is the stem and stern[176] of our whole happiness, that we may become one with God and after the example of divine concord may also be joined together into one among ourselves like members of one body under one head. What I advise here concerning the distinction of Persons Augustine in Epistle 92 piously advises about the vision of God.[177] Not content with this, I add 'subtle studies.'[178] In Latin the word *studium* sometimes means 'partisan favour,' as in Virgil:[179]

* * * * *

174 According to Scholastic theories, between any two instants another instant is discernible. No two instants can be continuous or contiguous; a stretch of time must intervene between them. In the divine generation an instant is to time what a point is to a line, according to Duns Scotus *Commentarii in Sententias* 2 dist 2 6 10–11.

175 Usually spelled 'circumsession' it is defined as that property by which the divine Persons, by reason of the identity of their natures, communicate with each other. Cf Thomas Aquinas *Summa theologiae* 1 43 5.

176 *Adagia* I i 8

177 It is not Epistle 92, but 112. This is probably a question of a printer's error in LB, XCII instead of CXII. All other editions have CXII. In this letter Augustine admonishes an Italian widow not to believe that we can see God with our bodily eyes. PL 33 318–21

178 *Curiosis studiis.* Erasmus frequently spoke out against the hyper-subtle language and investigations of Scholastic philosophers in particular, which he called *vana curiositas.* In a letter to Manrique de Lara, which constituted a kind of first draft of the *Apologia*, he says: 'But I do criticize the recondite inquiries of certain scholars into this subject, probing matters with the aid of human reason that even angelic understanding cannot fully fathom' (Ep 1877:223–5).

179 Virgil *Aeneid* 2.39

The doubtful crowd is split into opposing camps.

What good is it to mention how many disagreements arose from these questions among the Scholastics? Lastly, I add the word 'to dispute', obviously expressing disapproval for the contentious wrangling about these matters, and as Paul aptly says, *logomachia*. [1 Tim 6:4] So then, if I advised something that was pious and necessary, if my advice was given with such moderation, if what I advise confirms the opinion of the church and excludes the impiety of the Arians, what nerve they have in saying that I plead the cause of the Arians! Not even the bands of Scholastics have reason to be angry with me since I stated quite clearly that I do not even disapprove of the discussion of those matters that surpass human understanding, provided it be sensible, moderate, and religious.

But what I add to this seems harder to deal with at first sight: 'Certainly I do not see how what the Arians deny can be demonstrated except by speculative reasoning.' But from what precedes and from what I frequently affirm elsewhere it is clearly evident that what I say is pious. Refuting the objections of my adversaries, who wished that this passage seem necessary to convince the Arians, I showed that it was neither necessary, since it was abundantly clear from other passages, nor effective, even if it were established that this was written by the apostle. For us who were persuaded of this the passage was not necessary for convincing the Arians: it was not effective against those who would have something to answer that was plausible. And I am inclined to think that ignorance of the precise meaning of a word may give cause for calumny. *Docere* ('to teach') was used there for *evincere*' ('to prevail in a discussion'). A grammarian teaches literature in one way, an evangelist teaches Christ in another, a prosecutor teaches what charges he is making against a defendant in another. The grammarian persuades, the prosecutor, by means of documents, witnesses, presumptive evidence and arguments, prevails in the case so that the defendant has nothing to answer. I mention this in passing because I have learned by experience that those who have neglected the study of good letters and rushed suddenly into the study of philosophy and theology often fall into error, to my detriment and theirs: to mine since I am exposed to scorn without reason, to theirs since they inflict a more serious wound on their own conscience than they do on my reputation. In what way, therefore, would this passage win over the Arians? That the Son is of one substance with the Father, that is, of the same essence? Although they acknowledged that he was God and a great God, they denied that he was the true God. They recognized the true God not because he was the opposite of a false one but because he was God for a most perfect reason. That can only be God the Father, unless there is one who is of the same undivided

substance with the Father. But the word *homoousios* (of the same substance) is not in the Divine Scriptures. Therefore, by these alone one cannot teach what the Arians deny. For if someone protests to them that Christ is called the Son and the Son is born from the substance of the Father, the heretic will answer that pious men are also called sons of God and born of God. If someone should say to them that Christ is called God, they will answer that those to whom a sermon is given are called gods with the approval of Christ. And from another point of view, in how many ways is the simile Augustine uses to convince Maximinus at variance with the facts?[180] Man does not procreate alone and he procreates from a tiny part of his substance, and that which left him is not immediately man, and it is not the same substance with the father in number nor does the father transfuse his whole substance into the son, and the soul of man, his best part, is not created by the father nor is the son always like the father in all respects. Therefore, since this simile has so many differences, it will be valid for teaching the Christian, but it will have little effect in refuting the heretic unless argumentation be added to the irrefutable Scripture. The Arian concedes that Christ was not called Son in the usual manner and he was called God in a different way than men are called pious or princes in the writings of the Hebrews, and they admit that he was born of the Father. They admit that the substance of God is one of utter simplicity. From this a syllogism arises: 'If he is born in a singular manner from the Father, he is a Son not by adoption, but by nature. If by nature, he is born from the substance of the Father. But the substance can in no way be divided, as it cannot be increased or diminished. It follows, therefore, that the Father and the Son have the same undivided substance.' This is the reasoning of which I was speaking, which does not depend on the fabrications of men, as these men falsely claim, but is taken from the Divine Scriptures. Here the Arians are forced to be silent, but they will not be silent if only the passage in John is used to persuade them. If the Arians said that God was corporeal, it would be necessary to use other syllogisms and other witnesses from Scripture. Now since they acknowledge with us that the soul of man is a simple form and for that reason just as it is entirely present in the whole body, so it is entirely present in the single parts of the body, while the nature of God is so simple that nothing simpler can be imagined through reasoning, they are forced either to acknowledge what the Catholic church believes or betray their perversity.

* * * * *

180 The analogy used by Augustine was human generation. *Contra Maximinum Arianorum episcopum* PL 42 730

I admit that that passage in John, 'I and the Father are one,'[181] is able to strengthen the conviction of orthodox believers. There is very great agreement among those who are of the same essential nature, but these passages do not have the same efficacy with obstinate heretics. It is one thing to persuade the teachable, it is another to subdue the spirit of one who offers resistance. But if whenever in Scripture two are said to be one it is understood that they are of one undivided essence, according to that same passage in John all pious believers are one with Christ and from this one passage the Spirit, water, and blood are of the same undivided nature. More than that, Paul and Apollos[182] were of the same undivided substance because it is written: 'He who plants and he who waters are one.'[183] Likewise, whenever we commonly say that two people who are of like mind are one person, and whenever we say that friends have one soul, it will be understood that they have the same substance.[184] But if this is preposterous the heretics have a crack through which they can slip.

But orthodox believers have interpreted these passages in this way, and the church accepts their interpretation. She accepts it but she does not forbid other and better interpretations that can be made without doing violence to Scripture. Certainly, a harsh law is prescribed for us if we cannot give other interpretations of anything the ancient writers interpreted. What would happen when several equally respected men of the church differ in opinion among themselves? But let us suppose that all orthodox believers interpret in such a way and let us pretend that it is so accepted by the church that it is forbidden to disagree, disagree, I say, not in substance, but on the meaning of a passage, what does this matter to the Arians, who contend that the church exists with them and therefore they do not defer to the Catholic church?

It could not have escaped the attention of these examiners that this was my opinion if they read my works with both eyes open. As a matter of fact, the same annotation from which they excerpted these things for unfair criticism has words of this sort: 'Now since there are innumerable passages that teach about consensus and mutual good will, it will serve to strengthen the opinion of the orthodox, but I do not see what effect it will have in weakening

* * * * *

181 John 10:30

182 Apollos was a Jewish Christian, a native of Alexandria, who preached first in Ephesus and then in Corinth. He is described in Acts 18:24 as an eloquent man, well-versed in the Scriptures.

183 1 Cor 3:8

184 *Adagia* I i 2 'A friend is another self'

the pertinacity of heretics.'[185] What I called 'teaching' in previous citations here I call 'weakening the pertinacity of heretics.' Besides, it is clear how dispassionately I speak: 'I do not see what effect it will have.' I say that I do not see, conceding that some other more sharp-eyed person will see.

The authority of orthodox believers is not immediately shaken if they find that they have used arguments against heretics that can be refuted by men of keen intelligence. They were men, and in a fight it is lawful to defeat your adversary in whatever way possible so that he will become more docile; and great generals throw some weaker troops into the middle of the battle-line who help the army by their numbers rather than by their strength; different arguments have validity with different people. But if one should contend that all the arguments that the ancient writers use against heretics are of the most convincing certitude, what worth will that have among all men of learning except that it is the opinion of a very shameless person? He who concentrates on defeating his adversary leaves no stone unturned,[186] and Jerome thinks that you must deal in one way with the rebellious person and in another way with one who asks to be taught. I shall add an example if anyone should ask for one. St Jerome uses this argument against Jovinian: 'If it is good for a man not to touch a woman, then it is bad to touch a woman under any circumstances.'[187] If this reasoning is correct, one can say that marriage is bad. Again he argues in this way from the words of Paul: 'It is better to marry than to burn.'[188] 'What kind of blessing is this which is praised by comparison with something worse?' If this reasoning is true, nothing will be called good if there is something more perfect.

Furthermore, Augustine, arguing against the Pelagians from the words of Christ to John: 'If anyone does not eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, he has no life in him, etc.,'[189] concludes that baptized infants will perish for all eternity if they die without having received the Eucharist.[190] If this reasoning is true, the whole church is in error today. To add to this. Hilary uses this enthymeme against the Arians: 'If only the Father is true God, where is the false God?'[191] And yet 'true' is not always the opposite of 'false,' but often signifies exceptional perfection. Those who are reborn in

* * * * *

185 ASD VI-10 550:389–92
186 *Adagia* I IV 30
187 *Adversus Jovinianum* PL 23 229
188 1 Cor 7:9
189 John 6:53
190 *Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum libri quattuor* 1. 22 CSEL 60 457–8
191 *De trinitate* PL 10 137

spirit from God are called the sons of God;[192] yet they are not wrongly called the sons of God because Christ is truly called the Son of God. For they are also truly sons, but to a lower degree. And parents commonly say of pious and obedient sons, 'He is truly my son,' but that does not mean that the others are falsely sons. What Hilary concludes is very true, but the argument he uses is ineffective against one who resists it. If one criticizes an argument carpingly, he does not necessarily reject the conclusion. How many times does Scotus prove a conclusion although he judges some part of the syllogism to be defective. Here there was a single error, in the reasoning of Augustine there was a double error: first because he interprets the passage to mean the consumption of the body and blood when it refers more to the word of God; second, because although the passage refers mainly to the Eucharist, he thinks the sacrament is necessary for everyone's salvation, even if what he is striving to prove is true, namely, that infants, though they be born from Christians, are not free from sin. Didymus in his books on the Holy Spirit proves that he is God by this argument. Paul calls Christians the temples of the Holy Spirit;[193] from this he infers: 'If the Holy Spirit has a temple, he is God.'[194] This conclusion is believable among us, but has little efficacy against an enemy: first, because the language contains a metaphor; second, because if the enthymeme were well-founded, Peter and Paul, who have temples in Rome and in many other places, would have to be worshiped as gods.

Likewise, those who wish that the Virgin Mother did not contract original sin from our first parents adduce this as proof: 'You are all-beautiful, my love.'[195] It is agreed that this is said of the church, but even if we grant that it can be fitting also for Mary in the image of the church, Christ cleansed the church with his blood, and he did not find it all-beautiful, but he made it so, which these interpreters do not wish to be true of the Virgin. And the cleansed church is not altogether without stain, since no one lives without at least venial sins, but they do not admit this in Mary. Arguments of this sort are valid with one who is favourably disposed, but they do not change the mind of one who is reluctant to believe. Arguments that are drawn from allegories belong for the most part to this kind. I could collect many arguments both from these and from others of this type, but these suffice to give you a taste of them, and we must take care not to give ill-disposed persons

* * * * *

192 John 1:12, Gal 3:26
193 1 Cor 6:19
194 Didymus *Spiritus Sanctus* PG 39 1060A
195 Cant 1:50

the opportunity[196] to speak badly about men whose authority is respected among Christians. And one who is forced to write these things to learned men should not be criticized, but those who drive you to this point and publicize such things are worthy of blame since they move Camarina,[197] which it would have been better to leave untouched. The fact that I selected one or two passages is due to necessity, and the reason I do not pursue the matter as far as I could is out of regard for their authority. It is not necessary to show that a passage is obscure and has variant readings and various interpretations since the fact itself sufficiently declares it. Whoever wishes can compare manuscripts, read through interpreters, and look at my annotation, and if he does not find that things are as I describe them, let him call me into court. In the meanwhile, let him be silent and admit his insolence.

Finally, concerning their charge that this passage has been criticized by some people, I admit that this is true, and I do not add what kind of persons these critics were. But they should have added that I responded to them in such a way that they received little praise for their criticism among learned men. And the one who first stirred up trouble about this passage, besides knowing nothing about theology, was born for nothing else than sedition and calumny. His sin is slighter because what he does he does by nature. The doctrine of Paul was attacked by many more persons than this opinion of mine. The world is full of criticism. Those who make these charges seem to have taken their calumnies from these writings. Otherwise, if they had read my words, they should have at least rebutted in a few words the reasons I adduce to prove what I say.

OBJECTION 3. 'But in his book *On Praying to God* when he says: "It would be a good principle of the Christian religion to revere everything pertaining to divinity, but to affirm nothing except what is explicitly stated in the Sacred Scriptures,"[198] and here when he says, as was plainly evident in what preceded: "What the Arians deny cannot be demonstrated except by speculative reasoning," he is clearly guilty of error to leave the heresy of the Arians strong and irrefragable in his judgment.'

* * * * *

196 Literally, 'handle.' Cf *Adagia* I iv 4.

197 *Adagia* I i 64. Camarina was a pestilential marsh near the town of that name. The people drained it, ignoring the oracle's warning, and their enemies came in across it.

198 ASD V-1 146:867–9 / CWE 70 186

RESPONSE 3. Though up to this point they were nodding off, here they miraculously infer that by my words the Arian heresy is rendered unshaken and unassailable. This is a gross statement, but listen to the facts and you will discover that these are mere words without any substance. First, from all the passages that I enumerated selectively from my works (and twice as many could be cited), it is more than sufficiently clear that I have such a pious understanding of the equality of Persons that though he leave no stone unturned even the most prejudiced calumniator could not find anything to reprehend except that in some places I spoke without circumspection. And yet it seems to me that I speak with sufficient circumspection to the fair-minded reader, for, in the eyes of those who zealously seek out an opportunity to calumniate, neither Christ himself nor the apostles have spoken with sufficient circumspection.

In the book *On Praying to God*, from which this calumny was taken, these words follow: 'The purpose of this discussion is not to cast doubt on whether the Holy Spirit should be invoked, but before talking about the invocation of the saints I want to show how scrupulous our predecessors were about adopting anything that had not been handed down by the clear authority of Scripture, especially in those matters that surpass human understanding, etc.'[199] Therefore when I taught that the Father and the Son are invoked in a similar manner, as if they were of one power and nature, and then acknowledge that the Holy Spirit can be invoked in a similar manner, do I not profess clearly enough the equality of the three Persons? No doubt is cast there on the divine nature of the three Persons, on which there is perfect agreement; but the reader is cautioned about the normal manner of speaking of the Sacred Scriptures and the religion of the church. They have their own language, from which it is a matter of scruple not to depart. Perhaps I should explain here what religion is in the strict sense since we have to do with those who without grammar have become theologians. Religion in the strict sense means veneration joined with fear and awe. For that reason tombs are said to be 'religious,' because there is fear of desecrating them, and the ancient writers were anxiously concerned by what name they should call the gods with whom they dealt because they feared a great evil would result if anything in words or rites was said differently than was fitting. This religious fear was once present to worshippers of demons; much more should this type of reverence be present in worshippers of the highest and true God. How far

* * * * *

199 Actually, these words precede the previous quotation. ASD V-1 146:852–6 / CWE 70 185

they have departed from this religion who dispute – do I say dispute? – more precisely, they pronounce upon relations, instances, and incircumcessions, has been demonstrated above.[200] Even if this fear is excessive, it is still the proof of a religious mind. It was greater among early men than among those who followed them and little by little it has decreased, to the point of irreligious arrogance. Since prayer demands a great amount of religion so that man remembers that as he lies prostrate, he is speaking with that highest, omnipotent, and incomprehensible prince of the universe, I decided to give advice on this subject in a discussion about prayer. I wrote that a good part of the Christian religion is to revere divine matters that surpass understanding, and not to affirm anything except what is expressed in the sacred writings. I shall render this more intelligible by giving an example of what I am saying. In the Creed the Father is called almighty, creator of heaven and earth. If one were to use these words of the Holy Spirit, he would not be speaking irreligiously, but it would be contrary to the customary language of Sacred Scripture. Again, the Son is called the image of the Father; if someone were to say that the Holy Spirit is the image of the Father and the Son, he would not say anything impious, but perhaps he would be speaking irreligiously, contrary to the custom of the Sacred Scriptures. In addition, we read that the Father created the universe through the Son. Now if someone were to say that the Son created the universe through the Holy Spirit, the words would not, I think, contain any impiety but would be alien to the customary manner of expression of the Scriptures. And if we believe modern theologians, if one were to say three Gods, thinking that this name was suitable for the three Persons because God is sometimes used for the name of a Person, he would not be speaking impiously, but irreligiously, contrary to the custom of the Scriptures. Furthermore, if one were to say that the Spirit is the wisdom of the Father, he would say nothing impious and yet he would give offence because of the different usage of the Scriptures. In addition, although there is perfect equality of the three Persons, nevertheless, if one baptized in the name of the Holy Spirit, the Son, and the Father, he would be acting irreligiously because he would be departing from the word order of the Gospels, even if he had good intentions. There are countless examples of this kind, which it would be too long to rehearse. Let these suffice as an example.

Since prayer removes man's mind as far as possible from the images of all created things to pure contemplation of the divine majesty, I thought it opportune to give advice about the religion of one who prays, mentioning

* * * * *

200 See n176 above.

examples from the ancient writers who treat of divine things with extraordinary reverence. How often Hilary deprecates the crime of irreligion when he is about to speak about things that are to be adored rather than expressed in words.[201] How religiously Athanasius excuses himself because he was forced to use the word *homoousios* though it is not found in the Sacred Writings. How often does Augustine do likewise concerning the Trinity. How often Didymus does so concerning the Holy Spirit. At this point these are my words: 'And perhaps it is a good principle of Christian doctrine to revere everything pertaining to divinity, but not to affirm anything except what is explicitly stated in the Sacred Scriptures.'[202] I speak only of things that surpass our human understanding, as was said before. We believe in the perpetual virginity of Mary although this is not expressly stated in the Sacred Books; likewise, we believe certain sacraments not expressed therein, but handed down by our ancestors. I understand as expressly stated that which necessarily follows from the Sacred Writings. For example, it is not contained in the Sacred Books that the Holy Spirit is not the Son, but it necessarily follows. For when John and Paul call Christ the only begotten Son of God,[203] it is certainly inferred that although the Holy Spirit proceeds from the substance of the Father, he is not the Son, as we said previously about the term *homoousios*. If it is expressed in the sacred writings that Christ is man, by the same token it is expressed that he had a human soul. These statements are not in the slightest way in opposition to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, but are opposed to the audacity of certain men who assert things even if a reason cannot be given. That is why it seemed right to me to mention early religion, because I saw that the curiosity of some persons in their investigation and their rashness in making pronouncements had gone too far, and in addition to this the introduction into churches, where previously nothing was recited but canonical Scripture, of rhythmic verses and songs that draw laughter from learned men of austere character. This licence was carried over into the sacred service itself, in which instead of psalms we sometimes hear the not very lovely verses and proses that men compose,[204] no less ridiculous in their meanings than in their verbal structure. But if we want to indulge endlessly the feelings of the unlearned, in the end to what depths will the majesty of

* * * * *

201 Hilary *De trinitate* 4.1 PL 10 97B
202 ASD V-1 146:867–9 / CWE 70 186
203 John 3:18
204 A prose is an older term for what is usually called a sequence, a name derived from the Latin verb *sequi* 'to follow,' because it followed the alleluia verse. It began as a verbal or musical prolongation of the last syllable of the alleluia while the deacon proceeded from the altar to the *ambo* to sing or chant the Gospel. At

the church's worship sink? It shows great impudence to cite this passage for criticism when the equality of the three Persons is declared in this very passage, as was shown above, and immediately afterwards these words concerning the Son follow: 'They are not afraid to call the Son of God true God and direct their prayers to him.'[205]

But they think they have woven together two excerpts with marvellous skill, one from the *Annotations*, the other from the book on the method of praying, although in both places I proclaim the equality of the three Persons. They should rather have charged, if they wanted to criticize, that I contradict myself in the same passage, denying what I had affirmed shortly before, which is not something characteristic of heretics, but of the demented. In this way Ausonius put together the *Nuptial Cento* from half-lines of Virgil.[206] If, according to my meaning, which they try to pervert, they had understood 'explicitly stated in the Sacred Scriptures' to mean either that which is openly stated there or what evidently and necessarily follows from what is stated there; if they had accepted the reasoning as I showed I understood it, as not human but proceeding from the divine words, this passage would not be worth a straw for the Arians.

OBJECTION 4. 'Likewise, in the *Apology to Lee,* on the first chapter of John, he makes many improper inferences concerning the Father and the Son, such as "The Father is said to be his own beginning because he originates from no one else."[207] And this: "The Son partakes of the divine essence,"[208] and "I do not deprive the Son of the term 'first-beginning' if, in comparing the two, I attribute it more to the Father."'[209]

RESPONSE 4. If they have read my *Apology to Lee*, why do they not refute those reasons by which I there justify what they are misrepresenting? If, which I think is more truly the case, they did not read it but copied it from a catalogue made by some sycophant, they do not deserve a response. He who

* * * * *

first this composition was in rhythmical prose but later in verse. Among the most famous of the sequences is the *Victimae paschali laudes* for Easter Sunday and the *Veni, Sancte Spiritus* for Pentecost Sunday.

205 ASD V-1 146:862–3 / CWE 70 180

206 Decimus Magnus Ausonius, Latin poet of the fourth century, put together lines and half-lines from Virgil, changing the original meaning to create a salacious mock-epithalamium describing the celebration and consummation of a marriage.

207 ASD IX-4 161:527–8 / CWE 72 184

208 ASD IX-4 156:362–3 / CWE 72 176

209 ASD IX-4 162:536–7 / CWE 72 185

reads my apology to Lee's criticism 72[210] and 92[211] will clearly see that these words have been twisted in a slanderous manner. I do not call the Father his own beginning there, but I say that he is so called or could be so called by certain people with pious intent but inappropriate language. Those who say this are of the opinion that the Father originates from no one, by reason of the fact that he alone is the beginning without beginning, as in Lactantius it is said: 'He is *αὐτοφυὴς καὶ αὐτογενής*, ie "engendered and born of himself."'[212] In the same place[213] I cite the words of Augustine,[214] who says that the Father is the beginning of all deity; not that the Father is the beginning of the divine essence, but that he is the origin of the two Persons. I introduce these words as an example of inappropriate language, because no one can speak properly of the divine nature. Nor is it much more proper to say that the Father is 'the beginning of all deity' rather than 'his own beginning,' but with this stammering speech men explain what they understand as best as they can. For if he were the beginning of all deity, he would be the beginning both of all deity and of himself. Whoever thinks that I am speaking craftily may examine carefully all my books to see if I say in my own person, 'The Father is his own beginning' or 'The Father is from himself,' as some ancient writers said. Even if it were found, since I have explained my meaning in many places, no one could criticize me unfairly except to say that I did not use the proper words, but no human words are proper for divine things. How often do Athanasius, Hilary, and Augustine pray for this indulgence when they are to speak about the divinity, and excuse themselves for words that are less than appropriate,[215] as if 'Father,' 'Son,' 'Spirit,' 'generate,' 'be born,' 'person,' 'hypostasis,' '*homoousios*,' were proper words for divine things, and as if the Scholastic theologians, in their many discussions about the divine nature and about the distinctions between Persons always used proper words. He

* * * * *

210 ASD IX-4 158–63 / CWE 72 179–87

211 ASD IX-4 174–83 / CWE 72 201–14

212 *Divinae institutiones* 1 7 13 CSEL 19 28. Lactantius cites relevant verses from the oracle of Apollo at Colophon (*Sybilline Oracles* fg. 17).

213 ASD IX-4 178:75 / CWE 72 208

214 *De trinitate* 4 20 PL 42 908

215 Erasmus says similar things in his *Response to Lee*: 'But Hilary, Augustine, and Dionysius declare emphatically every time they speak of sacred matters that there are no human words through which we could express the ineffable and incomprehensible nature of the Trinity, and like it or not, we must speak inadequately about them, using what words we have.' ASD IX-4 156:340–4 / CWE 72 176

who does not allow anyone to speak about divine things except with proper words would order everyone to be silent.

I come now to the word '*particeps*,' although in the past I answered Lee exhaustively on this matter at Annotation 71.[216] The Greeks say *μετέχειν*, ie, 'to share with one another' while the Latins say *participem esse* ('be a sharer in'), and I admit the Greek word is more flexible. Although the word *particeps* is said to be from *pars* ('part'), nevertheless, in Latin usage the thing in which many are said to be sharers is not always distributed into parts, eg we are all said to share in the sun's light although the same sun in its entirety shines on everyone. And each member of the body is said to be a sharer of the soul although the soul is a simple and undivided form, entire in each member. Why, therefore, should anyone take offence if one should say that the Son of God is a partaker of the divine nature?[217] But if the novelty of the word offends anyone, St Hilary in the seventh book of his *On the Trinity* did not shy away from the more difficult word *impertitio* (imparting), speaking in this way: 'God the Father imparts his perfect nature to the Son without losing his nature.'[218] I have no doubt that the same word is also found in other passages. Lastly, I myself was the first to avert the fault of an improper word before I was criticized by someone. Therefore, those who find fault with things that are correct and make objection to something that has been explained previously are doubly shameless.

I come to this remark: 'I do not deprive the Son of the word "first-beginning" if in comparing the Father and the Son I attribute it more to the Father,'[219] although I have amply responded to that objection to Lee in answering his annotation 92.[220] The theologians dutifully teach that the most perfect explanation of the word 'beginning' is in the Father, next in the Son, and thirdly in the Holy Spirit, because the Father is without qualification the beginning of all things, the Son was the beginning from eternity, although he is not the beginning of the Father, the Holy Spirit was not the beginning from eternity, but began to be after creation. Thus I do not see what can be offensive in my words except that I said 'word' instead of 'reason' and 'more' instead of 'in a more perfect manner.'

* * * * *

216 ASD IX-4 156–8 / CWE 72 176–9
217 ASD IX-4 156:372 / CWE 72 177
218 *De trinitate* 7 28 PL 10 224B
219 ASD IX-4 162:536–7 / CWE 72 185
220 ASD IX-4 174–83 / CWE 72 201–14

Thus far nothing has been alleged that could be interpreted as opposed to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, but calumnies of this kind are shockingly opposed to Christian charity.

Against the Divinity, Dignity, and Glory of Christ. Chapter II

OBJECTION 5. 'In his little book *On Praying to God* Erasmus states that in the Gospel only the Father is called true God, in these words: "How scrupulous our predecessors were about accepting anything that had not been transmitted by the clear authority of Sacred Scripture, especially in matters that surpass human understanding. St Hilary had the same scruples; only after a long silence did he vigorously strive in twelve books to show that the Son of God was true God, although only the Father was called God in the Gospel."[221] These are his words there.'

RESPONSE 5. There is nothing here to which I have not amply responded again and again, and I will be in a fine predicament if I am forced to respond anew whenever this or that calumniator makes this same accusation against me. This whole question about the divinity of the Son, which Lee and Zúñiga bring against me, arose from this: in the *Annotations* that I wrote to the first chapter of John I mentioned in passing the habit of Sacred Scripture frequently to call the Father God, whereas it openly calls the Son God only in two or three places. This had been noted before me by the ancient writers. Lest this should offend anyone I added immediately, 'inasmuch as the word "God" is equally common to the three Persons.'[222] If anyone should doubt this, these words exist in the first edition, which I have indicated appeared in the year 1516. In later editions I did not remove this phrase but transferred it to another place that was more suitable, as in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans and several other places.[223] It was not so suitable in its previous position. Therefore, in substance I was in perfect agreement with Zúñiga; the dispute was only about the number of passages. And yet, not understanding

* * * * *

221 ASD V-1 146:854–8 / CWE 70 185
222 ASD VI-6 39:177 app crit 1519 edition
223 Rom 1:4 ASD VI-7 46:242–3, 'Patri fere tribuunt cognomen "Dei," Christo "Domini," quum utrumque vocabulum utrique pariter competat, eo quod idem est dominium Patris et Filii'

what I had said, Zúñiga heaped up many accusations that had nothing to do with the question and were completely irrelevant.

I was speaking about the word 'God' attributed to the Father or to the Son purely and simply, whereas he with incredible zeal collected passages declaring the Son to be God, the majority of which I have never denied. Therefore, whatever these persons put together from our dispute contains nothing opposed to the divinity of Christ, but against the great number of places in which he is openly called God. Even if Zúñiga comes out the winner in this, his victory consists merely in the fact that I had a lapse of memory, and there was a passage that escaped me at that moment. This does not follow: the Son is called God only in a few places in referring to the Persons, therefore he is not God. A single passage in canonical Scripture would have been sufficient to establish a firm belief in this dogma.

I will make my meaning clearer with an example. In the Creed three Persons are named and yet only the Father is called God, the Son is called Lord, the Spirit is called Holy. Likewise, how many times does Paul say: 'from God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ' to point out that this convention of Sacred Scripture does not favour heretics, but excludes heresy.[224] Otherwise, whoever did not know this convention of Scripture could suspect that the Son is not God, but only Lord. In addition, one who reads that the Son is wisdom could suspect that the Father does not have wisdom except from the Son; and one who reads that the Son is Lord could suspect that the Holy Spirit is not Lord, and he who reads that the Father is the creator of heaven and earth could suspect that neither the Son nor the Holy Spirit was a creator. To prevent this from happening I brought this to the reader's attention. Since this was persistently done by the early fathers of the church and merited them praise, what kind of perversity is this on the part of my calumniators to use as a charge of impiety against me that which drew praise for piety in the writers of old?

Now it is useful to see how they disguise their treatment of this passage that they bring forward for criticism. I profess here, as I clarified previously, that the Son and the Holy Spirit are equal to the Father, and it is not a question there of the unity of the divine essence, but of the religious scrupulosity of the ancient writers in the treatment of divine subjects, as I mentioned above. And I am inclined to think here also that they think religion is being called

* * * * *

224 As, for example, at 2 Cor 13:13–14: 'The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit be with all of you,' and Eph 6:23: 'from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.'

piety when I say that religion is reverence joined with awe. That may seem immoderate. Such is the meaning Hilary gave to the word 'religion' when he complains that through love of religion he was driven to irreligion.[225] He defines irreligion as the audacity to speak with human words about ineffable matters, for which he begs forgiveness. Athanasius begs this also, casting the blame upon others that he was forced to use the word *homoousios* although the Sacred Scriptures knew nothing of this word.[226] With a similar sense of religion Jerome avoided saying 'three hypostases' in the manner of the Greeks.[227] This sense of religion was the reason why Hilary was afraid for many years to write anything against the Arians, but then after close examination of the Scriptures and trusting in the authority of the councils of the church, he strongly resisted the Arians,[228] obviously well instructed on how to interpret the passage that the Arians cited: 'That they may know you as the only true God and Jesus Christ, whom you have sent,'[229] as I mentioned previously. He dared to affirm in many volumes that Christ is true God. No other meaning can be derived from my words, and I do not see what impiety this meaning contains. I attribute Hilary's silence to his religious scruples, that is, his fear of speaking about incomprehensible things. The fact that he wrote vehemently against the Arians I attribute to piety. What I proclaim here about Hilary I afterwards proclaim about all the others, especially more recent writers, saying: 'Later generations, after examining the sacred volumes more carefully and relying on the authority of their predecessors, are not afraid to call the Son of God true God and to direct their prayers to him.'[230] If I condemned later writers for proclaiming Jesus as God and directing their

* * * * *

225 *De trinitate* 4 1 PL 10 97B

226 Athanasius *Tomus ad Antiochenos* 5 PG 26 801B; *Epistola ad Serapionem* 1. 27 PG 26 593C

227 There was a confusion of terminology in the early church regarding the doctrine of the Trinity. At the Council of Constantinople in 381 the definition of the Trinity was standardized as three hypostases, the equivalent of persons, in one *οὐσία* or substance. When Jerome migrated to Syria and was living near Antioch, he encountered this definition, which to him was associated with Arianism. For him the word 'hypostasis' meant essence or substance, as in secular learning. He therefore wrote a letter to Pope Damasus, asking whether he ought to accept this formula, which he believed to be heretical. *Epistolae* 15 PL 22 355–8 / CWE 61 194–200

228 Hilary was called 'the hammer of the Arians.' His *De trinitate*, PL 10 9–472, is directed especially against them, particularly book 12.

229 John 17:3

230 ASD V-1 146:861–3 / CWE 70 186

prayers to him, I would not add 'after examining the sacred volumes more carefully and relying on the authority of their predecessors.' The words 'are not afraid' pertain to the religious scruples that the light of the Scriptures and the authority of the councils dispelled. There are many other things that the early writers did not dare to define, but withholding pronouncement they respected these beliefs, such as, whether the Holy Spirit proceeds from both Persons, whether small children should be baptized, whether the Eucharist should be given to them. And furthermore, in the Creed, which I think came from the Council of Nicaea, one sings: 'The Son, true God of true God'; the Holy Spirit is not even called God because it was proved later that he also should be called true God.[231] By these stages God wished to become known to the world. First he forbade that he be proclaimed Christ. And he was not immediately proclaimed God openly. Finally, he was acknowledged as true God also. When this point had been made, a similar question concerning the Holy Spirit followed. And I think pious men had a reverent understanding of the Spirit, but some religious scruple prevented them from declaring what was not yet clear from the Scriptures. All these things contribute to the strength of the Catholic faith and are opposed to the rashness of those who make pronouncements on divine matters which they should not. The advice I give here I give in many other places. I ask you again and again, dear reader, have they not brought out a strange weapon to convict me of favouring the Arians?

OBJECTION 6. 'Likewise, to confirm the same error he so cleverly distorts almost all authoritative statements in which the divinity of Christ is very clearly demonstrated that he seems clearly to defend the Arian cause. In the *Apologia contra Stunicam* concerning the first chapter of John, from which Augustine himself and other defenders of the faith derive strong and valid arguments by which the Arian impiety is clearly refuted, he uses evasions and impious commentaries of this nature: "Now I will reply in a few words to the ten passages that Zúñiga presents to me. Matthew[232] refers to the testimony from chapter 7 of Isaiah: 'Behold a virgin shall conceive and bring forth a son, and his name shall be called Emmanuel, which is interpreted

* * * * *

231 'Not even those who claimed with all their strength this attribute of consubstantiality for the Son dared to declare the same for the Holy Spirit.' *On Praying to God* CWE 70 188 / ASD V-1 147:906–7

232 Matt 1:23

"God with us."' [233] Here he claims that Christ is clearly called God, especially since Jerome interprets it this way in his commentary on the prophet.[234] First of all, Christ is not clearly called God in the words of the prophet, but the meaning of the name that is given him is that through his birth God will be favourable to the human race.[235] God is said to be with those whom he favours. So the Greeks also in expressions like *σὺν τῷ θεῷ* ('with the god'), *σὺν ταῖς Μούσαις* ('with the Muses') express the wish that they will show their favour and good will. Jerome does not explicitly say what Zúñiga misrepresented him as saying. Let the prudent reader re-read that passage attentively to himself and he will discover it is so. For the present I am aiming at brevity.

The fact that the Jews infer that Christ claimed divinity for himself because he called himself the Son of God[236] does not contradict my argument. Christ himself demonstrated that it does not follow that whoever is the Son of God is God by nature, showing that pious men were also called sons of God and were even called gods.[237] But even if it followed perfectly, it does no harm to my argument since I admit that there are many passages in the sacred books from which we certainly deduce that Christ is God. In that passage when he said: 'And the Word was God'[238] Christ is openly called God; it seems to me that it can be deduced from more valid reasoning than through the explicit naming. John teaches that the Word of God was from the beginning,[239] or rather was without beginning, before the creation of the world, and that the Word was of divine nature and afterwards was made man. Since he took on what he was not so that he would not cease to be what he was, it is clearly deduced that the same Person was of dual nature, divine and human, and I have testified that this is deduced from many passages of Divine Scripture, and I would be impious to doubt anything in this matter.

* * * * *

233 Isa 7:14
234 Jerome *Commentary on Isaiah* PL 24 107B
235 Jerome uses the verb *appellatur* to say that the one bearing the name Emmanuel does not mean that he is God, but that God is with his people. Then, using the verb *vocabitur*, which is the more proper verb to express the meaning 'to call by name,' Jerome says that he will be called Jesus, that is, Saviour.
236 John 10:33. In this passage the Jews accused Christ of blasphemy 'because though only a human you make yourself God.' (Not the Son of God, which weakens Erasmus' argument.)
237 Eg Matt 5:9, Luke 20:36, John 10:35
238 John 1:1
239 Ibidem

But more evident is what Thomas exclaims after touching Christ's side: 'My Lord and my God.'[240] Here someone might hesitate, saying that this is an exclamation and not an assertion about Christ. But I prefer that this passage be included among those in which Christ is clearly called God. I do not wish to be subtle, giving some offence to the weak,[241] especially since we are not talking about Christ, but about a lapse of my memory and my insufficient knowledge of the Scriptures.[242] If my adversary should win, the only danger is that Erasmus did not read or did not remember passages in which Christ is openly called God. Then concerning what Paul said in the Acts of the Apostles, chapter 20: 'Keep watch over yourselves and over the whole flock, over whom the Holy Spirit has placed you as overseers to govern the church of God, which he acquired by his blood,'[243] there can be a double uncertainty. First, Christ can still be understood as subject from what preceded: 'Which I received from the Lord Jesus, etc,[244] so that we understand that the church is said to belong to God the Father, as if it were his family, which Christ claimed for his father by his blood. It can also be understood that the Father calls the blood of the Son his own since it was at his instigation that the Son underwent death for the salvation of the world."'[245]

RESPONSE 6. I pointed out previously that the discussion of these passages has nothing to do with the divinity of Christ. Yet I did not enter upon that discussion without a preliminary word about Catholic belief, saying: 'Without calling into question in any way whether Christ was God and man, which certainly ought to have been beyond all doubt for us even if it were read only once in the sacred writings, but in order that the zealous reader would inquire for what reason the apostles openly and continually attribute the name of God to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit in a different manner; since I realized that some were offended by this passage or, what I think is more likely the case, they took this as an opportunity for calumny, etc.'[246] In the later edition

* * * * *

240 John 20:28–9
241 1 Cor 8:9
242 This refers to a sarcastic remark of Zúñiga insinuating that Erasmus was not an assiduous reader of the Sacred Scriptures, ASD IX-2 126:372.
243 Acts 20:28–9
244 Acts 20:24
245 This entire objection, beginning with 'Now I will reply,' is quoted verbatim from *Apologia respondens ad ea quae Iacobus Lopis Stunica taxaverat in prima duntaxat Novi Testamenti aeditione* ASD IX-2 126–8:342–81.
246 ASD IX-2 124:323–8

I added these words: 'Even if from several passages it is securely inferred that Christ was God and not merely man.' With this fixed and unshakeable foundation, in a few words I shall destroy the arguments of Zúñiga, etc.'[247]

With this exordium I entered into that discussion. I closed the discussion on this same subject that I had with the person who came to Zúñiga's assistance with these words: 'I would wish that Christ were called true God even a thousand times in the Sacred Scriptures, although we are no less convinced of this than if he was called that ten thousand times. Would that all the Jews had been equally convinced of it.'[248] Finally, in the very words that they recite in order to demonstrate that I have impious opinions about the Son, it is stated in every instance that I have correct opinions.

Last of all, the Arians did not deny that Christ was God, but the question was about his name and the word *homoousios*; in this matter there was no controversy between Zúñiga and me, but only on the usage of the Scriptures. Therefore, what do they cry out with such belligerence? That the true divinity of Christ is proved by these passages? I have always openly admitted this, at least from a fair number of passages. They have such mental acuteness that they do not see the main point of the discussion. I affirm that the hesitations that I refer to in my disputes with Zúñiga are not mine but can be adduced by heretics. Since the disputation itself says these things and since I affirm them so many times in my response to Sancho, it is the height of impudence to repeat these attacks as if I had never responded.

OBJECTION 7. 'In the passage in the Epistle to the Romans, chapter 9: "From whom came Christ according to the flesh, who is above all things God blessed forever. Amen,"[249] someone might question whether this statement should be separated in this way: 'who is above all things' and then, with an interjection of silence, would add as an *epiphonema*,[250] 'God be blessed forever,' so that this phrase is of one who gives thanks to the Father, who placed Christ above all things.'[251]

* * * * *

247 ASD IX-2 124:328–31. This was added in the 1519 edition. In the LB text the verb '*diluam*' is omitted by error.

248 *Apologia contra Sanctium Caranzam* ASD IX-8 52:764–6 / LB IX 413E. Erasmus says in this same passage that in the third edition of the New Testament (1522) he omitted the words about Christ being called God only in two or three places, ASD VI-6 39 app crit.

249 Rom 9:5

250 An interjectory remark summing up a previous argument.

251 ASD VI-7 229:483, the 1522 edition, retained in the 1527 edition, app crit

OBJECTION 8. 'Of another passage, at Philippians, chapter 2, "Who though he was in the form of God, etc,"[252] we have already stated that this was explained also by Ambrose as not referring to the human and divine nature,[253] and it is not properly an appellation, and since orthodox interpreters have different opinions it cannot be said to be a clear statement. Again, concerning the passage in Colossians, chapter 2: "In him all the plenitude of divinity dwells in bodily form,'[254] besides the fact that the appellation we mentioned can be denied, it also receives another interpretation, namely, that whatever pertains to human happiness was amply given to Christ by the Father so that he need not seek it from the philosophers or from Moses or from the angels. It is as if Paul were repeating what he had said shortly before this: "In whom are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge."[255] Moreover, the addition of the word *σωματικῶς* (in bodily form) is more in contrast with the shadows of the Mosaic law than referring to the divine nature.'[256]

OBJECTION 9. 'At the passage in the Epistle to Titus, chapter 2: "Awaiting the blessed hope and coming of the glory of our great God and Saviour,"[257] aside from its patent ambiguity,[258] for this cannot be denied, we have explained that Ambrose interprets the first part as referring to the Father, not to the Son.'[259]

OBJECTION 10. 'Concerning the argument brought forward from the Epistle to the Hebrews, chapter 1: "To the Son: your throne, O God, is for all time,"[260] not to express doubts about the authority of this Epistle and not to ask you

* * * * *

252 Phil 2:6

253 ASD VI-9 288–4:229–300. In his annotation Erasmus follows Ambrosiaster, who explains *forma Dei* as not referring to Christ's divine nature but to his superhuman goodness and power, which was manifested in raising the dead, restoring hearing to the deaf and cleansing lepers while he retained his human form. Ambrosiaster *Comm in Phil* PL 17 408BC. Erasmus admits that Hilary and Augustine interpreted *forma Dei* as referring to Christ's divine nature. ASD VI-9 290:246–60

254 Col 2:9

255 Col 2:3

256 This objection is taken word for word from Erasmus' *Apologia contra Stunicam* ASD IX-2 128:387–98.

257 Tit 2:13

258 The ambiguity consists in whether we should interpret 'great God and Saviour' as referring in the first word to God the Father and in the second to Christ, or to interpret both words as referring to Christ.

259 ASD VI-10 202:348–54; Ambrosiaster *Ad Titum* 2:13 PL 17 530A

260 Heb 1:8. The reason for the ambiguity in this verse is that Hebrew has no vocative case, using the nominative instead.

to support my view of the evident ambiguity of this passage,[261] which I shall indicate in its proper place, certainly this passage is cited from the Old Testament,[262] although I speak of the apostolic Scriptures in which they proclaim Christ in their own words with the rhetorical colour that I was able to use also in the first passage that Matthew introduced from the prophet, "God with us.'[263]

OBJECTION 11. 'Lastly, what is adduced from the First Epistle of John, chapter 5: And let us be in his true Son, Jesus Christ; he is the true God and life eternal,"[264] not to mention other reservations, we are not compelled to apply this to the Son. The meaning could be, indeed this is what the one who wrote it seems to have meant: "And let us not be in the devil or the vain and deceitful world, but in the true Father, and this through his Son, Jesus Christ, through whom we are joined to him; for he, the Father, is the true God and life eternal, source of all things."[265]

OBJECTION 12. 'At Romans 9, although the authority of the Apostle is very clear when he speaks about Christ: "Who is God blessed for all ages,"[266] and this is the plain, simple, and manifest meaning, in which also, as Erasmus himself testifies, all the manuscripts agree, he resorts to this shameless equivocation, saying "unless this clause was added, just as we have come upon certain other additions, etc."[267] And in addition, in confirmation of his error he

* * * * *

261 Erasmus discussed the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews in an appendix to his notes on the Epistle, ASD VI-10 236:809–903. He cites several passages from Jerome, Origen, and Augustine, all of whom expressed doubt about the authenticity of the letter, but makes no definite pronouncement of his own, merely emphasizing that doubt about its authorship arose at an early date, 236, and in a long argument in his *Apologia ad Fabrum* ASD IX-3 161–8 / LB IX 53B–56E / CWE 83 79–86.

262 Psalms 44:6

263 Matt 1:23: 'And they shall call him Emmanuel, which means "God with us."'

264 1 John 5:20

265 Erasmus' interpretation is based more on the Greek text, which is quite different from the Vulgate.

266 Rom 9:5

267 ASD VI-7 224 app crit 428–66. This phrase follows immediately upon the cue phrase 'qui est in omnibus Deus' in the first three editions, but then Erasmus says unequivocally: 'in this passage, certainly, Paul openly called Christ God, and the Greek copies that I have seen are in agreement.' The inquisitors fail to cite these words. In his own translation and *Paraphrase* (CWE 42 53). Erasmus followed the tradition in identifying Christ with God in this passage.

introduces an erroneous sentence, rejected by Ambrose,[268] who interpreted it correctly, appending this statement: "Because it was more expedient in those times for the preaching of the Gospel."[269] He also adds a foolish analogy to persuade the reader that this is an addition: "Phrases of this sort are found added to many passages as a conclusion of a reading, just as it is customary for us to add: 'You, O Lord, glory be to the Father, etc.'"[270] With this one statement he provides heretics and infidels with the opportunity to weaken the strength of the whole Gospel. When he speaks of that fabricated silence and untimely interjection to destroy the unity of the statement,[271] who will listen to him without embarrassment or laughter?'

RESPONSE 7. And yet all this, as has already been frequently said, contains nothing offensive, since the dispute is not concerned with substance, but with the number of passages, and it is not a question of what I bring forward, but what my adversary can falsify, and although in so many places I profess so clearly the divine nature of the Son and the *Paraphrase* at this passage explains the argument we are dealing with,[272] nevertheless, so that the malicious desire to calumniate may become more evident, I will refute a few things selectively.

* * * * *

268 Ambrosiaster, commenting on this phrase, says: 'Since therefore no mention is made of the name of the Father, while there is a reference to Christ, the conclusion cannot be avoided that it is Christ who is called God.' Ambrosiaster *Comm in Rom* 9:5, PL 17 138C–139A.

269 This phrase is present in the 1519 and 1522 editions, ASD VI-7 229 app crit 483–500. Erasmus often states in the *Annotationes* that in the letters of the apostles the Father is called God and the Son Lord. In the annotation on 1 Tim 1:17 ASD VI-10 42–4: 372-5, he says: 'It is rare in the letters of the apostles for the name 'God' to be attributed to Christ or the Holy Spirit, whether to avoid giving offence to some, or because they were keeping it for its own time—for the apostles did not immediately preach Christ as God or as the Son of God.'

270 CWE 56 251. It is interesting to note that in the 1519 edition Erasmus added the phrase: 'so among the Greeks, at the end of the Lord's Prayer, there is added as a conclusion, "Yours is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever and ever. Amen."' This doxology does not exist in the two earliest manuscripts of the New Testament, the Sinaiticus and the Vaticanus, but it is found in the Washingtonensis of the fourth or fifth century and it is included in the Greek Textus Receptus at Matt 6:13, but not at Luke 11:4.

271 'Fabricated silence' refers to Erasmus' statement that Christ was rarely called God in the time of the apostles, and 'untimely interjection' refers to the interpretation of the last part of the sentence as a doxology.

272 LB VII 806D / CWE 42 53

First, the opinion of orthodox writers remained unchanged even if it was agreed that this passage was taken to refer to the Father, not to the Son. St Ambrose implies that there were some who interpreted this passage as referring to the Father, otherwise he would not refute their opinion, and he does not refuse to make a concession if someone should prove which Person was referred to. These are Ambrose's words: 'If, however, anyone thinks that the words "who is God" do not refer to Christ, let him indicate which Person they refer to.'[273] But it has already been pointed out that if we change the punctuation of the word *est*, it can refer to the Father, to whom is ascribed everything he previously said was conferred upon the Jewish race – the glory, the law, the promises, the covenant, the worship, and the patriarchs – from which Christ was born to us according to the flesh, who surpasses the dignity of all of them, and thanking God the Father for such a great beneficence, Paul adds: 'Who is blessed for all ages.'

If this reading is not clear, or if the meaning is not suitable, my commentary could have been consulted. But orthodox writers punctuate differently. Let us grant that, and I together with them, but here it was a matter of what the heretics can call into question. And yet I do not see how this passage can be an obstacle for the Arians, who admit that Christ is God and a great God, but deny that he is true God and of equal substance with the Father. But if we try to exclude every objection of the Arians, they would be able to question also 'And the Word was God' and 'My Lord and my God,' and a thousand other passages of this kind.

But as to their objection to my comma, let them know that the other punctuation affords an even greater opportunity for heretics: the article placed before the participle has the effect that this part can more easily refer to what follows, cut off from what preceded. For this is the Greek text: *ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*. The meaning of these words that occurs more readily to one who is learned in the Greek language is 'God, who is above all things, be blessed for all ages.' If there is a period before *ὁ ὢν*, there is a comma after *Θεός*. The meaning is devotional, that the doxology be sung from the wonder inspired by divine goodness towards the human race. But if you put a comma before *ὁ ὢν*, and a comma after *ἐπὶ πάντων*, the meaning will be that Christ is above all things. From this it is concluded that Christ is God, but he is not called God simply and openly. But our discussion concerned the fact that Zúñiga pointed out that there were more than three passages in the New Testament in which Christ was clearly given the name

* * * * *

273 Ambrosiaster *Commentarius in Romanos* CSEL 81 1 305

of God.[274] If St Ambrose admits of the interpretation that these words refer to someone other than the Son,[275] if the Person is given, we have shown that the passage can be adapted in two ways to the Father, with a pious meaning and most suitable to Catholic belief. If it had said *ὅς ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός* or *ὅς ἐστὶν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός*, etc, their interpretation would be more probable because the pronoun *ὅς* connects these words more to what precedes than *ὁ ὤν*, although the same meaning can be derived from both texts. But since he said *ὁ ὤν*, this part of the sentence is very easily detached from the preceding context. Likewise, the doxology that is sung in the Epistle to the Romans[276] similarly begins with the prepositive article,[277] *τῷ καὶ δυναμένῳ* ('to the Almighty') etc. The doxology that closes the third chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians begins with these same words.[278] No one would object that in the word *εὐλογητός* the substantive verb 'becomes' or 'is' is understood since that is the custom in the Sacred Scriptures, as in the canticle of Zacharias: 'Blessed be the Lord God of Israel,'[279] and 'Blessed art thou among women.'[280] Likewise Paul: 'Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.'[281] Similarly Peter: 'Blessed be the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.'[282] How many times does this form of speech occur in the Psalms? Therefore, since it is almost a characteristic of the doxology that the verb be understood, it should not seem new here. Moreover, it has been noted in the writings of St Paul that sometimes in the midst of the flow of the language, as if carried away, he prays or adores or gives thanks to God or glorifies him, especially when something has been mentioned about the mysteries that must be worshipped or the ineffable goodness of God. An example of this, in addition to the two passages we just indicated, is the one from Romans 11: 'O height of the riches, etc.'[283] Phrases of this type are sung separately as if outside the flow of the language. Therefore, it is not my intention to dispute further nor to undermine

* * * * *

274 Erasmus argued for three passages and challenged Zúñiga to enumerate ten, as he claimed, ASD IX-2 130:422–4.
275 Ambrosiaster *Commentarius in Romanos* CSEL 81 1
276 Rom 16:25
277 Ie an article that precedes the word
278 Eph 3:20
279 Luke 1:68. In the original Hebrew and Greek of all four examples the verb 'to be' is left out.
280 Luke 1:42
281 2 Cor 1:3
282 1 Peter 1:3
283 Rom 11:33

the interpretation of the ancient writers. Let each person have his own uncompromised opinion. As for myself, I profess before God that Paul seems to have meant, as I just indicated, that this phrase does not pertain peculiarly to Christ, but either to the Father or to the whole Trinity, so that this praise is common to all the Persons. It is not necessary to assign this to a Person other than the Father, since the word 'God' often embraces the three Persons. At all events, Chrysostom in his commentary mentions the Father, who with the Son had such concern for human salvation, but he does not direct this passage against the Arians,[284] although Theophylact does.[285] In view of these facts, although in that passage I discuss not what I, but what someone else might question, nevertheless, I concede this passage to Zúñiga and take his side, or rather I do not go over to his side, but profess my old opinion. But if we had to contend with an enemy, how would we defend this passage as clear and irrefutable when it can elude our grasp because of its double meaning? To add to all of this I have declared that the Arians cannot be proved wrong by this passage; otherwise they would have imposed silence on John's Gospel, whose authority they do not reject.

RESPONSE 8. Concerning what was said about the form of God, if it is true that Ambrose gives another interpretation, let them quarrel with him and exonerate me, and yet in the *Paraphrase* I include a meaning that is opposed to the Arians.[286] What I added about the word 'bodily' is not my comment, but that of the most respected orthodox writers.

RESPONSE 9. There is nothing here that requires justification unless perhaps that what I said can be refuted, which I do not think is the case.

REPONSE 10. I give the same answer as I do to objections 11 and 12.

* * * * *

284 John Chrysostom *Commentarius in Romanos* 1. 16 PG 60 552
285 Theophylact *Expositio in epistolam ad Romanos* 9:5 PG 124 461B
286 *Paraphrase* on Phil 2:6. LB VII 996B / CWE 43 373. 'But Christ, although he was by nature God and, moreover, by his very deeds demonstrated that he was God – restoring the dead to life at will, changing natural elements, commanding the demons, with a word driving out all sorts of illnesses – still, in order to provide for us an example of perfect modesty, he did not demand for himself through vainglory that he be considered equal to God, but he humbled himself and lowered himself in the eyes of men.'

RESPONSES 11 AND 12. They return to the earlier discussions and say that this passage[287] is the most effective one in Paul, but I think that 'And the Word was God' (John 1:1) and 'My Lord and my God' (John 20:28) are more effective.

In actual fact it is a very effective passage, in my opinion, but not in the same way against the Arian or the Jew. The sense is clear and manifest, but I have pointed out two passages that are not at all obscure and no less pious. They cite me as having said that all the manuscripts are in agreement, but that is not the case. In the *Annotations* I indicate that Cyprian in *Against the Jews* omits the mention of God.[288] However, I compared this work with a very old manuscript, although it is not very important since no one is above all things except God. What does the annotation say, then? 'If there were not such a great consensus among the manuscripts.' It is significant that there are no manuscripts that do not have this phrase in that passage, while in the one in Romans there are variant readings. What is this shameless doubt to which they say I resort? I merely propose things for the reader's consideration. Since I had taken it upon myself to indicate the variety in the reading, punctuation, and meaning, how can I be said to be avoiding the issue when I simply propose giving more approval to that which I am accused of avoiding? What error of mine do they present, which they say I am eager to confirm? That of the Arians? I have shown sufficiently, I think, how much sympathy I have for them. Of the Cerinthians[289] or the Jews? I don't think that even the man who wrote these things suspects this of me, no matter how adversely suspicious he is and no matter how shameless in his false criticism. What error do I confirm here, then? That I say that this passage may be interpreted in this way? Let them show that it is not possible or let them hold their tongues. I proved that it can be so taken and in fact can easily be given that interpretation. What is more insulting than this language? Or what is more insane? It has been amply demonstrated how strange it was that Ambrose excluded this meaning. Furthermore, as to their prescribing that we not depart from the interpretation of the ancient writers, who interpreted a particular passage in their struggle with heretics, while I admit that we must show great deference to the most approved doctors, we do not accept the law that it is

* * * * *

287 Rom 9:5

288 ASD VI-7 229 app crit 483–550 1519 edition. Erasmus' title, *Adversus Iudaeos*, refers to Cyprian's *Ad Quirinum* 2 6. In CCSL 3 37, CSEL 3.1 70 and PL 4 730B the word 'Deus' is present in this verse. In the Erasmus edition (Basel 1520) 275 'Deus' is omitted.

289 See n73.

not permissible to find something more exact after them. But if they bind us by this law, what will they say when the doctors differ among themselves? What of the fact that the Scholastic doctors reject, whenever it suits them, any opinion at all of the approved ancient authors? What happens when there is a slip that is too obvious to be concealed? I have indicated several letters of that kind and I could point out many others. Therefore, let them not thrust down my throat a law that they have never observed themselves. Formerly, debates over dogmas of the faith took place before a mixed audience. What inappropriateness is there if pious doctors sometimes allowed themselves in the explanation of Holy Scripture what they often allow themselves in allegories, and believed that one must act more stupidly when dealing with the stupid? Is all that authority of theirs suddenly precarious? But if we have to plead our case according to such exacting judgments, their whole authority has long since collapsed so that it is apparent that in their books there are certain testimonies from the Scriptures that have been twisted into a heretical meaning.

They also criticize my saying that it was more fitting in those times.[290] It is not surprising that the name of God was not attributed to Christ among the uninstructed and those not yet capable of understanding such a great mystery.[291] If this is false, let Chrysostom be brought to judgment and Jerome and Augustine, whose authority I have followed, and the facts themselves declare that what I recommend is true. Obviously this was the pearl that the Lord forbade to be cast before swine,[292] and this was the hidden wisdom that Paul secretly speaks of among those who are perfect.[293] They were not proclaiming that he was mere man if they did not openly call him God, but Lord. For in fact when Paul wrote to the Philippians: 'So that at the name of Jesus Christ every knee should bow of those in heaven, on earth, and in the underworld,'[294] he did not attribute the name 'God' to him, but attributed that loftiness which to pious hearers would signify divinity. Otherwise Paul did not proclaim Christ rightly in the Epistles, so often calling him Lord

* * * * *

290 Cf objection 12.

291 In his annotation to 1 Tim 1:17 Erasmus states: 'It is rare in the letters of the apostles for the name God to be attributed to Christ or the Holy Spirit, whether to avoid giving offence to some or because they were keeping it for its own time – for the apostles did not immediately preach Christ as God or as the Son of God.' ASD VI-10 42:372–5. Also at 2 Cor 1:2 ASD VI-8 327:7–8.

292 Matt 7:6

293 1 Cor 2:6–7

294 Phil 2:10

although he calls the Father God. And the Creed, which was once taught to catechumens, would have to be condemned because in it neither the Son nor the Holy Spirit is called God, but only the Father. John was the first to call Christ God in a clear voice. I speak of the written word for the light of the Gospel was already gleaming throughout the whole world.

Now what is it that I try to prove to be an addition? This doxology of Paul? Are not such persons ashamed of an obvious falsification? On the contrary, I testify that it does not seem to have been added. These are the words of the *Annotation:* 'In a similar way this could seem to have been added at the closing part of the discussion and the beginning of a new chapter, if there were not such a great consensus among all the manuscripts.'[295] Is one who says that the general consensus precludes that this could be an addition trying to show that it was added? But that suspicion could fall upon the doxology that is in Romans because it is not contained in some of the manuscripts; in some it is added to chapter 14, in many it is added at the end.[296] Nevertheless, this is not to say that what has been added was added by others. They think this added exclamation is something quite irreligious while I attribute it to the great piety of Paul towards God so that often in the midst of his discourse he was carried away with adoration of the divine majesty.

Then what is the meaning of these impious words of the pamphlet: 'He provides heretics and infidels with the opportunity of weakening the strength of the Gospel everywhere'? Has the whole Gospel collapsed if it is thought that Paul added a doxology? Or even if it is established that it was added by others? And has the authority of the Psalms diminished because 'Glory be to the Father, etc.' is sung by the voices of the church? Or does the Lord's Prayer have no weight because the Greeks added the colophon of a doxology and even interpret it as if it formed part of it? The Epistles of Paul were recited with great reverence in the assemblies of the Christians, and they had particular prayers, thanksgivings and doxologies. The closing phrases of the Pauline Epistles attest to this although, as I said, he sometimes interrupts the flow of the discourse with such doxologies. Now is anyone going to pretend that if those men of ancient times, while Paul was alive

* * * * *

295 ASD VI-7 229 app crit 1519 edition

296 This doxology, usually placed at the end of the Epistle (16:25–7), is an unsolved problem. The Greek witnesses strongly support its position at the end and a majority of the Latin manuscripts as well. Erasmus also includes it at the end, beginning with the 1527 edition, as does the Vulgate. A full discussion of the problem may be found in Bruce Metzger *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London 1971) 533–6.

and conscious or when he was dead, added the ending that the Latin manuscripts have at the end of the Epistle to the Romans, as the church added the *Gloria Patri* to the Psalms, the whole Gospel will collapse on the spot? And yet we have not spoken of the Gospels. If Paul knew that this was done and was pleased with its piety, he added it. If he did not know, we still accept reverently whatever has been handed down by the leaders of the church and continue to respect the teachings of the Apostle, although a doxology does not teach but venerates and adores what was said. But if we are so fastidious that because of the addition of one or two phrases we reject all of Sacred Scripture, either the canon of the Mass will have to be rejected, where it is agreed that two words, 'and eternal,' have been added in the words of consecration of the chalice,[297] or the whole Gospel must be repudiated. Then since both Jerome points out in several places and I have discovered some added words in the canonical books that are not apostolic truth, whether this was done by scribes and learned men through personal zeal or by the public consensus of princes of the church, the authority of the Scriptures would have collapsed long ago. But if this variation does not undermine the authority of the Scriptures, much less would one or two doxologies added to a discussion of doctrine do so. I do not claim that this was done. Although the suspicion is probable in the doxology added to the Epistle to the Romans, I remove any suspicion in the passage under discussion. First, because the one in Romans is not in all manuscripts, nor is it in the same place, and besides the reading is not certain and the rather muddled language does not correspond to Pauline style. In addition, it does not arise naturally from the context, whether you put it at the end or in the middle, as in the ones in the same Epistle, chapters 11 and 12.[298] Likewise, in the Epistle to the Ephesians, chapter 3.[299] I could produce many arguments here, but I think these are sufficient to dispel the false charge of impiety. If they take pleasure in putting others to shame or ridicule, let them be ashamed of such malice and laugh at such stupidity. I would not like this to be said so much against those who collected these things as against the slanderous book from which they were excerpted. There are many things that are rightly discussed among learned

* * * * *

297 Thomas Aquinas gives this explanation: 'The addition of the words "*et aeterni*" and "*mysterium fidei*" were handed down to the church by the apostles, who received them from our Lord, according to 1 Cor 11:23, "I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you."' *Summa theologiae* 3, q 78, a 3, ad 9.

298 Rom 11:36 and 9:5. There is a misprint in LB, IX instead of XII.

299 Eph 3:14–16

men, but are uselessly drawn out into lengthy disputes. And there is a class of men born to be of use to no one, but only to make trouble for those who are trying to do something for the public good and they have no other claim to fame. No one else is more of an obstacle to the Christian cause, when they defend it in their perverse way. But back to the subject.

OBJECTION 13. 'And in Mark, chapter one, he says: "Where the Hebraic tradition and the Septuagint have 'Make straight the paths of our God,'[300] Matthew (3:3), Mark (1:3), and Luke (3:4) wrote 'his paths' perhaps because the evangelists hardly ever attribute the word 'God' to the Lord because of the profane ears of those times, as we will demonstrate more fully in discussing Paul."'[301]

RESPONSE 13. Why they bring forward this passage I do not know. How many times do orthodox writers such as Chrysostom and Jerome remind us that the apostles did not immediately call Jesus God in the presence of unlearned people? And of the evangelists only John openly calls him God.[302] They should rather have rebuked my drowsiness for thinking that the words of this prophecy referred to the Son when the prediction refers either to the Father or to the entire Trinity. For Jerome interprets that the glory of the Lord was proclaimed when, after the Son was baptized, the Holy Spirit descended in the form of a dove and the Father spoke from the cloud: 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased' (Matt 3:17; Mark 1:11; Luke 3:22).[303] They should rather have criticized me because I was inattentive and added an annotation that was not entirely fitting here. It is not fitting unless the words of the prophecy refer specifically to the Son. This fault must be remedied in the next edition.[304] If what I say is true, even if not in the right place; if Peter at the beginning proclaimed Jesus to the mixed multitude without mentioning his divine nature; if Paul similarly calls him simply a man before the Athenians;[305] if nowhere do we read that the apostles, speaking before the people, made express statement of the divine nature in Christ; if the holy doctors say that this was the will of the Holy Spirit because the ears of the Jews were not yet capable of sustaining so great a mystery, and the impiety

* * * * *

300 Isa 40:3
301 ASD VI-5 354–5:107–9
302 John 1:23
303 Jerome *Comm in Matthaeum* 3:16 CCSL 77 19
304 This annotation was omitted in the 1535 edition.
305 Acts 17:31

of the pagans would have been provoked more quickly to blasphemy than to repentance, what sin do I commit in saying the same thing? They thought that this advice should be given so that simple souls would not doubt Christ's divinity because while the Father is so often called God, the Son is rarely designated by that name, and they remove the praise of piety in order to oppose impiety. So when I give the same advice, am I favouring the Arians? And by making the same effort they made to eliminate the error of the Arians or the Cerinthians, am I defending impiety? Again and again I ask you, Christian reader, what can be imagined more shameless than this calumny?

OBJECTION 14. 'Likewise, in the *Annotations* to the first chapter of John, justifying himself defensively because he translated *In principio erat sermo*, *etc* he said: "What sacrilege was it if in a book meant for private reading I should use *sermo* instead of *verbum* or *eloquium* or *oratio* or *vox* or any other word that has the same meaning?"[306] Does Erasmus say this in contradiction to what Hilary says in the book *On Synods*? "If anyone says that the Son is the engrafted or extended word of God, let him be anathema."'[307]

RESPONSE 14. Up to this point they might have seemed to be in error; here they seem to be purposely joking. Otherwise there could be nothing more insane than what they allege. Hilary says in the book *On Synods*: 'If anyone says that the Son is the engrafted or extended word of God, let him be anathema.' First, I wonder if they have read Hilary; I wonder even more if they understand what they have read. And yet these are not the words of Hilary, but were translated by Hilary as best he could. For he had only a slight knowledge of Greek, of which Jerome is a witness as well as the evidence itself. From what precedes this passage and from what Hilary says elsewhere, it appears that here 'the engrafted word of God' does not mean to be born, but to be introduced by hybridization,[308] like any creature whatsoever, into partnership with divinity, and 'extended' would signify coming into being through an extension or prolongation of the divine substance, because

* * * * *

306 ASD VI-6 30:21–3 (all the editions, including LB, print *rationem*, but I read *orationem*, as in *Annot in Ioannem* ASD VI-6 30:23). Cf also *Apologia de In principio erat sermo* LB IX 121E / CWE 73 38.

307 Hilary *De synodis* 46 PL 10 515A

308 Erasmus here imitates the vocabulary of Hilary, inventing his own untheological term, *insititium,* modeled on Hilary's *insitum* (grafted). It would seem that he is attempting (and no doubt succeeding) to confound his accusers with this very esoteric language.

in Latin 'to stretch out' is sometimes equal to 'to extend.' Immediately before this he had said: 'If anyone should speak of an extended substance of God, etc,' [understood 'let him be anathema'] and before that: 'If anyone should say that the substance of God can be extended and contracted.'[309] And in the second volume he says: 'There is no cutting away or division or acquisition.'[310] Likewise in the eighth synod he says that the Word is not an emanation or a part of the Father, but a complete birth.[311] And in the first book of the first tome, referring to various opinions of heretics concerning Christ, he mentions that some denied the true birth of the Son, saying that it was an extension into rather than a descent towards man, and that the Son of God did not exist before he was conceived in the Virgin, while others denied his eternal birth, saying that the Son was created, and the divine will had adopted him into the semblance of divinity, not equality.[312] Again, recalling the opinion of Sabellius,[313] he says in the second book that Sabellius extends the Father into the Son, etc.[314] Again in Book 6,[315] 'Valentinus alleged that he was born through a prolongation of the Father.'[316] He used the same words in Book 6: 'Hieracas said that the Son is a lamp from a lamp.'[317] Since this is the truth of the matter, what are their accusations? If anyone who has the same understanding of the Son of God as the orthodox writers were to call him *sermo* or *eloquium* or *oratio* or any other word that has the same significance instead of *verbum* (I have excluded the doctrine since it is only the word that is being discussed), would he then necessarily deny the

* * * * *

309 Hilary *De synodis* 43 PL 10 514C
310 This passage is not from *De synodis* but from *De trinitate* 2.8 PL 10 57B.
311 Hilary *De synodis* 22 PL 10 497B
312 Hilary *De trinitate* 1.16 PL 10 36C–37A
313 Little is known about Sabellius himself. Like the modalists the Sabellians denied the permanence of the three Persons, believing that the distinctions in the Godhead were merely transitory.
314 Hilary *De trinitate* 2.4 PL 10 52B
315 IV in LB, a printing error for VI
316 Hilary *De trinitate* 6.5 PL 10 160B. Valentinus (fl 120–60), a native of Egypt, was a Gnostic theologian. His concept of God incorporated many Platonic and Pythagorean elements. According to him redemption was effected by Christ, who united with the man Jesus to bring men the true knowledge of gnosis, which is given only to the Valentinians.
317 Hilary *De trinitate* 6.5 PL 10 160C. Hieracas of Leontopolis in Egypt (late 2nd–early 3rd century) was an ascetic and one of the leaders of the monastic movement in Egypt. He was a follower of Origen, believing in the pre-existence of souls and the spiritual nature of the resurrected body.

true birth of the Son and agree with the Cerinthians that he came into being when he was conceived in the Virgin, or with the Arians that he is a creature associated with the name of the divinity, or with the Valentinians that the word issued not from the Father, but from the intellect and truth, or whatever other blasphemies heretics believe? But the same annotation[318] from which they excerpted these words for calumny demonstrates that words of this kind were used by Cyprian,[319] Jerome,[320] Augustine,[321] Prudentius,[322] Claudian,[323] Lactantius,[324] Remigius,[325] Anselm,[326] Bede,[327] Thomas,[328] and who did not use them? Jerome teaches that all words by which the Greek *λόγος* can be expressed are appropriate for Christ.[329]

Since for the Father it is the same thing to bring the Son into being as to utter the word, it would not be inappropriate to say that the word is produced, issues, or is brought forth, or any similar verb, from the Father. These people perhaps reason in this way: *eloquium* comes from the verb *eloqui* ('to speak'), but to speak is to utter a word, and the word *prolativus* comes from the verb *proferre* ('to utter'), therefore he who calls the Word of God *eloquium* or *proloquium* understands with Valentinus that the Word is *prolativus*.[330] What is more absurd than this fiction, especially since my *sermo*, which they quote, professes the eternal Word from the eternal Father.

Furthermore, if it is a question of the propriety of a word, in the part of the *Apologia* where I responded to the criticism of the passage, 'In the beginning was the Word (*sermo*),' I demonstrated that *verbum,* which comes from

* * * * *

318 Ie in John 1:1 ASD VI-6 32 44–8
319 Cyprian *Ad Quirinum* 2 CCSL 3 37
320 Jerome *Comm in Eph* 1:3 and 1:15–18 PL 26 475C and 488C
321 Augustine *Tract. In Ioh.* 108 3 CCSL 36 617. He states here that many manuscripts have the reading 'In principio erat sermo.'
322 Prudentius *Cathemerinon* 6 1–4 CCSL 126 29
323 Claudianus *Carmina minora* 32 2
324 Lactantius *Divinae institutiones* 4 8 CSEL 19 299
325 Remigius of Auxerre *Expositio in epistolas S.Pauli ad Heb* 4 12 PL 117 849B. The attribution to Remigius is disputed.
326 It is not certain whether this is Anselm of Canterbury or Anselm of Laon. The citations ascribed to either of them by Erasmus are not found in modern editions of either author.
327 Béda *In Iohannem expositio* ad Joh 17:17 PL 92 883B
328 Thomas Aquinas *Super epistolas Pauli lectura* 2 383 ad Heb 4:12
329 Jerome *Epistolae* 53 4 CSEL 54 449
330 Meaning 'being uttered'

verberare ('to beat the air')[331] or from *vero boante* ('the resounding truth') is more inappropriate than either *sermo* or *proloquium* or any similar word.[332] It is foolish to argue about the propriety of words in a discussion that treats of divine matters. And lest anyone make the charge of scandal from the novelty of the word, I added 'in a book that is read in private.'[333] In this article I am compelled to find lacking in those who write such things not only integrity and learning but also a sound mind.

OBJECTION 15. 'And in the *Annotations* to Mark 9, in a very unseemly manner he calls Joseph Christ's stepfather in these words: "From this we learn that he [Christ] also practised the trade of his stepfather."[334] And at Luke 2 he says that Christ advanced gradually in wisdom and grace as in age,[335] although in his usual way he is trying to escape the pit that lies open for others.'

RESPONSE 15. Since Mark 9 is the wrong number and nothing of this sort is found there, perhaps we should not impute it to those who copied these things from the faulty book of the calumniator,[336] but they certainly did not excerpt it from my writing, for the passage they refer to is in Mark 6. If a stepfather is the husband of your mother but is not your father, what inappropriateness is there in calling Joseph the stepfather of Christ? He is called 'father' by the evangelists, but it would be difficult for me to call him that. It was correct in meaning; the calumny concerns the misuse of the word. I was afraid of calling him father since I was speaking in my own name; if I had said foster-father I would have spoken less clearly. I said stepfather, meaning not the real father, but still the true spouse of his mother.[337]

* * * * *

331 Cf Isidore *Etymologies* 1.9.1.

332 *Apologia de In principio erat sermo* LB IX 120B / CWE 73 36. Erasmus jokingly tries to rival Isidore in devising strange etymologies.

333 LB IX 122E / CWE 40

334 Actually the passage is Mark 6:3, ASD VI-5 382:801–2.

335 Luke 2:52

336 Erasmus continues to refer obliquely to Edward Lee as the instigator of these charges.

337 In most manuscripts of the New Testament Christ is referred to as the son of the carpenter and Mary. In Matt 13:55 he is also called the son of the carpenter. Erasmus gives the Vulgate reading, *faber, filius Mariae* (the carpenter, son of Mary). From this he concludes that he practised his father's trade. The term *vitricius* (stepfather) is never used by the evangelists. In the 1535 edition Erasmus changed this lowly word to *pater legalis.*

As to what I proposed for consideration, whether it may be piously believed that the divinity communicated its grace and gifts to Christ's human nature by degrees, I ask nothing more than that they read the passage which they cite.[338] Nothing else will better refute this calumny.

OBJECTION 16. 'Likewise, in the first chapter of Luke he dangerously removes the tiny phrase "of you" (*ex te*) from the words "what shall be born of you,"[339] for some Greek codices also have this reading, and on this authority the heresy of the Sabellians is refuted.'

RESPONSE 16. My annotation reads thus: 'But those two words, "of you" are not found in any Greek manuscripts nor in Theophylact[340] nor in ancient Latin manuscripts, except for one, in which someone had added it in the margin. Therefore, I wonder how they got into the first edition of this work, etc.'[341] From what source did I remove these two words? Not from the Greek manuscripts, in which I did not find them, nor from the ancient manuscripts, but from my edition, in which someone without my knowledge added the two words and afterwards I discovered it.[342] Johann Reuchlin provided me with a manuscript of the New Testament, which was more beautiful than accurate.[343] It had been left here by some cardinal at the time of the Synod. Although those in charge of correcting proofs had a very old manuscript of Theophylact, they preferred to follow the beautiful one. Thus it happened

* * * * *

338 In fact, the contrast between this verse, Luke 2:52, and John 1:14, 'and we have seen his glory, the glory as of a father's only son, full of grace and truth,' did give rise to controversy, as is apparent from Athanasius *Oratio contra Arianos* 3 26 and 52ff PG 26 380B and 432.

339 Luke 1:35

340 Theophylact *Enarratio in Lucam* 1 34–5 PG 123 704D

341 ASD VI-5 462:472

342 The words appeared in the first edition of his *Novum Testamentum*, which he called *Novum Instrumentum*, in 1516. He removed them in the 1519 edition, where he remarks that they were added by a commentator, 'apparet adiecta ab explanatore quopiam.'

343 This is Codex Basiliensis A.N. IV.2, a twelfth-century manuscript, regarded as an important witness to the text. It came from the library of Cardinal Ivan Stojkovič of Ragusa (modern Dubrovnik), who had brought it with him to the Council of Basel and left it at his death with the Dominicans of Basel. It does have the phrase *ἐκ σοῦ* ('of you'), which Erasmus omitted in this passage. The phrase is not contained in modern critical editions of the Greek New Testament. Cf Jerry Bentley *Humanists and Holy Writ* (Princeton 1983) 127–32.

that sometimes my annotation did not fit the context. As soon as I discovered this, I ordered them not to correct anything according to that manuscript, which seemed to have been emended to the widely used recent reading of the Latin manuscripts.[344] What difference is there whether these words are expressed or inevitably understood? Right before this are the words: 'You shall conceive in your womb and bear a son.'[345] Will the Sabellians suddenly flourish if these two little words are absent? By what forces, therefore, were they subdued by the Greeks and Latins who did not read 'of you,' as is clear from the writings of the ancient writers? And is one who was not persuaded by so many passages in which the Virgin is called the mother of Jesus and is said to have conceived Jesus and brought forth her first-born Son and other innumerable passages suddenly going to become silent in the face of two little words? As if mucus does not come out of the nose although it is not of the substance of the nose. Moreover, when the evangelist Matthew used the same preposition of the Holy Spirit, from whose substance the Son does not derive, what importance will the preposition have? And if it is dangerous for the Christian faith if 'of you' is not added here, it is much more dangerous that Matthew both in the Greek and Latin manuscripts says this: 'For what is born in her is from the Holy Spirit.'[346] How badly they spend good time spoiling paper with nonsense of this sort!

OBJECTION 17. Likewise, in explaining the passage in Romans 5 "In the likeness of sinful flesh" he said very dangerously that to say Christ assumed the person of guilty man was a kind of play-acting." These were his words. He gives heretics the opportunity to say that the Son of God took on a phantom body.'

RESPONSE 17. This was a very stupid statement, but what follows is more stupid, even if they give the wrong passage. It is not chapter 5, but chapter 8.[347] I repeat there what I commented on chapter 5,[348] that *ὁμοίωσις* and *ὁμοίωμα* are closer in meaning to *assimilatio* than to *similitudo*, which corresponds to *ὁμοιότης*. That Christ assumed the role of guilty man when he was bound, accused, condemned, spat upon, scourged, and crucified, since in truth he

* * * * *

344 The phrase in question is omitted beginning with the 1519 edition.
345 Luke 1:31
346 Matt 1:20
347 Rom 8:3, ASD VI-7 194:854–7 / CWE 56 201
348 Rom 5:14, ASD VI-7 162:364–7 / CWE 56 164

was not what he took upon himself in his outward appearance, I call *hypocrisis*, using a more appropriate word than if I had said simulation or dissimulation.[349] *Hypocrisis* in Greek means an action by which one represents a personage, as when in plays a man takes the part of a woman or a common person takes the part of a tyrant. So Christ took upon himself our person, that is, the part of guilty men, since he was to pay the penalty for us. I could not explain my interpretation in more fitting language. And it is a pious meaning unless perhaps it was truly wicked. It is not forbidden to use words in their original meaning even if at times they can be taken in a bad sense. See how dangerous it is to deal with those who know neither Greek nor Latin and therefore nibble away at whatever they do not understand. It would really be a strange state of affairs if because of one little word a heresy that has been buried for centuries should sprout up again. But the same danger exists in the word 'likeness,' if when something is called a likeness, it is a negation of truth, as there is a likeness of a man in a statue. But on this subject we have already answered Pierre Cousturier.[350] I ask you, dear reader, to compare that terrible title, 'Against the divinity, dignity and glory of Christ' with these trifles. They are indeed prophets of themselves, for while those who wish to be seen as pillars of the Christian religion publish such impudent and ignorant calumnies, especially among the common people, the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, to which all glory is due, is assailed with blasphemies among impious men.

Against the Divinity of the Holy Spirit

OBJECTION 18. 'Erasmus in the prologue to his *Works of St Hilary* says: "Saint Hilary at the end of Book 12 does not dare to make a pronouncement about the Holy Spirit except that he is the Spirit of God, nor would he have dared to say that if he had not read it in St Paul."[351] And further on: "Hilary nowhere writes that the Holy Spirit is to be adored, nowhere assigns to him the word

* * * * *

349 Erasmus was aware that he was using a daring metaphor taken from the stage in this annotation to compare Christ's assuming the role of sinful man to an actor, as is implied in the word *hypocrisis.* He uses a polite phrase, *absit invidia dicto* ('if you will forgive the expression'), to apologize for his language. The Spaniards ignored it.

350 *Apologia adversus debacchationes Petri Sutoris* LB IX 806A–D, where he discourses on the word *dissimulare.*

351 Preface to the edition of St Hilary (Basel 1523), Ep 1334:378–81

God."[352] And later: "In which (viz. Divine Scripture) though the name of God is assigned to the Son several times, it is never explicitly assigned to the Holy Spirit."[353] And later: "The Father is most frequently called God, the Son several times, the Holy Spirit never."[354] And later: "We have reached such a point of audacity that we have no scruples about dictating to the Son how he ought to have honoured his mother. We dare to call the Holy Spirit God, which the ancients did not dare to do."[355] These are the words of Erasmus.'

RESPONSE 18. From the preceding statements it is clear how shamelessly they have been twisted into calumny. The passages they compile have no other aim in their context than to express the religious fear of ancient writers in speaking of ineffable things and the irreligious temerity of certain more recent writers. If anywhere in twelve books Hilary states that the Spirit is to be adored, if he attributes to him the name of God, I shall admit that I had a lapse of memory, since concerning the substance of the matter there is no dispute. And so that I could not be accused of a lapse of memory, I added 'as far as I know.'[356] These words were omitted by them because they did not serve the purpose of calumny. You recognize Christian charity, dear reader, in my not wishing to impute this to them but to a deceptive book, from which the facts themselves show these excerpts have originated. Again, if the name of God is so openly added to the Holy Spirit in the canonical books, as it is often added to the Father in the Gospels and the Epistles, rarely to the Son, I confess to a lapse of memory. But that the older writers dared to pronounce less often on divine matters I attribute to religious scruple, that is, to a reverence for ineffable mysteries. They were waiting for a more accurate exegesis of the Scriptures and the authority of the church. This is expressed in what follows: 'Later writers, relying on more careful investigation of the sacred volumes and on greater authority, are not afraid to call the Son of God true God and to direct their prayers to him.'[357]

I speak to the same purpose in my preface to Hilary: 'St Hilary at the end of Book 12 does not dare to make any pronouncement on the Holy Spirit except that he is the Spirit of God, and he would not have dared to say this if

* * * * *

352 Ep 1334:440–1
353 Ep 1334:450–2
354 Ep 1334:466–8
355 Ep 1334:473–7
356 Not found in Allen.
357 This is a summation of lines 452–68.

he had not read it in Paul; he does not dare to use the word 'creature' because he had not read it anywhere in Sacred Scripture.'[358] This kind of profession would not be sufficient in this age because the necessary diligence of the ancient Fathers has been very instructive for us, but we are carried needlessly further afield.

And a little further on these words of mine occur, which they have reported in a mutilated fashion: 'In which [Scripture] although the name of God is assigned to the Son several times, it is nowhere explicitly assigned to the Holy Spirit.'[359] These words follow: 'Even if afterwards the careful investigation of orthodox writers ascertained with sufficient proof from Holy Scripture that whatever was attributed to the Son was appropriate to the Holy Spirit.'[360] You see, gentle reader, the trickery of the holy Inquisition, of which Erasmus has such a poor opinion. Why did they not add this little part? Because it entirely eliminated calumny. Therefore they were not seeking after truth but were zealously aspiring to make false charges. With this skill malicious calumny wove its quilt together.

With similar guile they reported the other passage in a truncated form: 'The Father is most frequently called God, the Son several times, the Holy Spirit never.' But it goes on to say: 'And these remarks of mine are not meant to call into question what the authority of the orthodox Fathers has handed down to us from Holy Scripture, but to show how much religious scruple the ancients had in making pronouncements in theology.'[361] What kind of skill is this that you collect proof of heretical opinion from the same page on which there are so many things that contradict that same opinion? This is not the assiduity of bees, not the sincerity of charity, which suspects no evil,[362] but the skill of spiders, who suck poison from healthy flowers, or rather to speak more truthfully, turn the health-giving juice into poison and, if it be permitted to speak the genuine truth, it is the art of him whose name in Greek is derived from calumniating.[363]

I have no doubt that the extraordinary impudence of these men is evident to everyone. But listen to something that is much more wicked than

* * * * *

358 Ep 1334:378–83
359 Ep 1334:450–2
360 Ep 1334:453–5
361 Ep 1334:469–2
362 1 Cor 12:6
363 The word 'devil' is derived from the Greek *διάβολος*, a translation of the Hebrew 'Satan' (calumniator).

these inferences. I censure the temerity of certain recent writers in their pronouncements on divine matters in these words: 'We have reached such a degree of audacity that we have no scruples about dictating to the Son in what manner he should have honoured his mother. We dare to call the Holy Spirit God, which the ancient writers did not dare to do. Such are the words of Erasmus.'[364] Who will tolerate the blasphemy of these words? But listen, reader, to this utterly shameless trick. This discourse originated in this way: I was saying that those Fathers of old, who made sparing comments on the Holy Trinity out of a sense of religious scruple, worshipped it more holily than we, who have more certain knowledge of it. And here I censure in passing the irreligious audacity of some, who in attempting to prove that the Virgin Mother was conceived without the stain of original sin, use this argument: 'He owed the highest honour to his mother and he was obliged to grant her the honour of being conceived in this way, and because he was obliged, he was able, and therefore he did it.' Of similar audacity is the teaching of those who say that even Christ seated in heaven is under the command of his mother, and therefore the church sings: 'Show yourself to be a mother,'[365] that is, command your Son to do what we ask. But this, I think, does not stir them very much; they are moved by what I add: 'We dare to call the Holy Spirit God, which the ancient writers did not dare to do.'[366]

I wish the preceding to be seen as temerarious and I submit this as an example of similar temerity. O detestable words! Who would put up with this? Who would not execrate such shameless, defamatory malice? I hardly think Satan would dare anything like it. With what malicious devices these men dead to the world have woven together these horrid words? But the discussion was a pious one if it had been reported in its entirety. It continues with no break: 'But we have no scruples about driving him repeatedly out of the temple of our souls by our evil deeds, just as if we believed that the Holy Spirit is nothing but an empty name, while the majority of the ancient writers, who revered the Son with the greatest devotion nevertheless feared to use the term *ὁμοούσιος*, etc.'[367] What am I reprehending here? Is it that we dare to call the Holy Spirit God? Not at all. For I approve of this in the same

* * * * *

364 Ep 1334:475–6, cited at the end of Objection 18. The accusation leaves out the word 'true' (God), and the phrase 'proceeding from the Father and the Son.'

365 This is the beginning of the fourth stanza of the hymn *Ave maris stella*, usually attributed to Venantius Fortunatus.

366 Ep 1334:475–6

367 Ep 1334:477–81

preface. But I brand as a vice the fact that although we are more fully instructed, yet we are inferior to those who were less instructed, although with the increase of knowledge the veneration of the divine majesty should have increased. What I say is so evident that it should be apparent to a blind man, as they say.[368] What, therefore, were those who made these charges thinking who turn them into suspicions of Arianism? I shall explain it in a simple word: either they are pure blockheads or they thought no one would read my works, or they considered the judges themselves to be blockheads.

Suppose someone were to turn words taken from the Pauline epistles into calumny in this manner: 1 Corinthians, chapter 8, says: 'There are many gods and many lords'[369] is against the first commandment. At Romans 3 he writes: 'Let us do evil so that good may come of it.'[370] (Rom 3:8) – that is against sound teaching. Likewise, in 1 Corinthians, 15, he speaks of himself and all other Christians: 'We are more miserable than all men'[371] – this is contrary to that other evangelical precept, 'Blessed are those who have not seen and have believed.'[372] If anyone were to attempt this, would he not do something that would be absurd in the judgment of everyone? No one is so shameless as to deny it. And yet among the things I pointed out above there are some that have no more sense or impudence than these.

But if they quibble about the words 'we dare,' which seem to have a pejorative meaning, I shall cite to them this phrase from the canon of the Mass: 'Admonished by saving precepts and formed by divine teaching, we dare to say, "Our Father, etc."'[373]

OBJECTION 19. 'This same person in his book *On Praying to God* speaks very scandalously about the divinity of the Holy Spirit and says things that cannot be said without impiety, as if his divinity were not clearly taught in the Sacred Scriptures, or that the holy Fathers had not dared to profess it and more recent writers were not more audacious in proclaiming it, forgetting what, among the Greeks, St Athanasius said in his *Declamation against Arius*,[374] what St Basil said in the five books *On the Deity of the Son and the Holy Spirit* against the

* * * * *

368 *Adagia* I viii 93
369 1 Cor 8:5
370 Rom 3:8
371 1 Cor 15:19
372 John 20:29
373 These are the prefatory words to the recitation of the Lord's Prayer in the Mass.
374 *Apologia contra Arianos* PG 25 247–410

heretic Eunomius,[375] what Didymus said in his books on the Holy Spirit,[376] St Cyril in the *Thesaurus*, Book 13;[377] and among the Latins St Cyprian in his *Exposition of the Apostles' Creed* and the *Sermon on the Holy Spirit*,[378] St Jerome in the explanation of the Creed,[379] St Ambrose in the book *On the Holy Spirit*[380] and frequently on Paul in other places, St Augustine in the books *On the Trinity*,[381] what almost all the ancient orthodox writers wrote about the divinity of the Holy Spirit, what the Council of Nicaea, what all three creeds[382] derive openly and with solid proofs from the Sacred Scriptures on the divinity of the Holy Spirit have approved for belief and affirmed to be confessed under the obligation of the Catholic profession of faith.'

OBJECTION 20.[383] 'He says: "The current situation suggests that we should discuss briefly in passing to whom prayer should be directed.[384] We see that the established prayers of the church handed down to us from early days, I mean those we call 'collects,' are mostly directed to the Father, some to the Son, none to the Holy Spirit, though there is mention of the three Persons in

* * * * *

375 *De Spiritu Sancto* PG 32 67–219; *Anatreptikos aduersus Eunomium* PG 29 498–774. Eunomius (d 394) was an Arian bishop of Cyzicus in Mysia in Asia Minor. His doctrine was called Anomoean (from the Greek *ἀνόμιος*, 'unlike'), according to which the Son, being begotten, was unlike the Father, who was unbegotten. His heresies were countered by the Cappadocian Fathers.

376 Cf n195.

377 Cyril of Alexandria *Thesaurus de sancta et consubstantiali Trinitate.* Erasmus uses the word *Liber* for Cyril's term *Λόγος* or Latin *Assertio*. Discussion of the Holy Spirit is contained in Assertio 34, not 13, Migne PG 575A–617C. At the Council of Ephesus in 431, over which he presided on 22 June, Cyril called for the corroboration of the edicts of the Council of Constantinople, which reaffirmed the Nicene Creed.

378 Cyprian. These titles are not found among the works of Cyprian in PL 4.

379 Jerome *Expositio Symboli*. This work was formerly attributed to Jerome, but is now assigned to Rufinus of Aquileia PL 21 335–86.

380 Ambrose *De Spiritu Sancto* PL 16 697–816

381 Augustine *De trinitate* PL 42 819–1098

382 Athanasian, Nicene, Apostles' creeds

383 This objection is taken, word for word, from Erasmus' *De modo orandi* ASD V-1 144–5:829–56 / CWE 70 184–6.

384 By 'the current situation' Erasmus must be referring to the controversies stirred up by Luther and his followers on the subject of prayer. He focuses here on prayers to the different Persons of the Trinity.

all of them.[385] We see that this practice was scrupulously observed by the ancients. For not even in the many prayers that we use on the feast of Pentecost is there one that calls upon the Holy Spirit, at least in those that the priest pronounced on behalf of the whole people. Yet in the songs that the people chanted invocation of the Holy Spirit is not avoided, as in the sequences, hymns, and antiphons.[386] Such were the religious scruples among the ancients that they did not dare to say anything that was not found in Holy Scripture. For that reason the prayers of all of them are generally directed to the Father because it is written explicitly and frequently that the apostles were admonished to pray to their heavenly Father, but in the name of the Son.[387] Moreover, in the Gospels the Son frequently addresses the Father in prayer; he promises the Holy Spirit but does not pray to him. Although the apostles are often told to petition the Father in the name of the Son, in John alone do we read, though only once: 'If you ask me for anything in my name, I will do it.'[388] This pronoun 'me,' however, is not found in most Greek manuscripts and is not in any of the Latin manuscripts either. Certainly Theophylact does not have it or explain it, which he would undoubtedly have done if he had it in his text since he takes issue on that verse with the Arians. He argues from the words, 'If you ask anything,' that the Son has equal power with the Father.[389] He would have had a stronger argument if the text had read, 'If you ask anything of me.' Yet such a reading raises troubling doubts: how is it consistent for anyone to ask for something of Christ in the name of Christ unless perhaps we are asking for something from Christ as a man in the name of the Son of God? Yet Stephen in Acts was not afraid to say, 'Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.'[390] Accordingly, the purpose of this discussion is not to cast doubt on whether the Holy Spirit should be invoked, but before talking about the invocation of the saints I want to show how scrupulous our

* * * * *

385 The word *collecta* was used to signify the collecting of the petitions of the various members of the congregation into a single prayer. In the Mass the collect is recited immediately before the readings. They are usually addressed to God the Father and conclude with a coda naming all three persons of the Trinity.

386 These chants were called either proses because they were often composed in rhythmical prose, or sequences because they followed the Alleluia verse. The sequence for the Mass on the feast of Pentecost is the beautiful *Veni, Sancte Spiritus.* Hymns to the Holy Spirit may be found in *Lateinische Hymnen des Mittelalters* ed F.J. Mone, vol. 1, numbers 179–95.

387 See John 15:16, 16:23–4.

388 John 14:14

389 Theophylact *Enarratio in evangelium Ioannis* (on John 14:14) PG 124 176D

390 Acts 7:59

predecessors were about doing anything that had not been handed down by the explicit authority of Holy Scripture, especially in matters that surpass human understanding."'

OBJECTION 21.[391] 'St Hilary had the same religious scruples; only after a long silence did he vigorously strive in twelve books to show that the Son was true God, although the Father alone was called true God in the Gospels.[392] To my knowledge, he nowhere dares pronounce the Holy Spirit to be God,[393] nor does he claim that he is to be adored, but merely must be merited.[394] He shrinks from saying that the Holy Spirit is something created, although Jerome is not afraid to pronounce the Son of God a creature."[395] He says these things there and repeats the same thing in the Prologue to St Hilary.'[396]

RESPONSE 19. From the above statements it is abundantly clear that these passages also have been collected by them by false pretence from the same book. The first question concerns the same essence of the Son. After that has been discussed, the question of the Holy Spirit follows. I do not speak there of all

* * * * *

391 This objection quotes loosely from *De modo orandi Deum* ASD V-1 146:856–61 / CWE 70 185–6.

392 See *De trinitate* 1.13 PL 10 35B–C.

393 'Indeed nowhere does he write that the Holy Spirit must be adored and nowhere does he assign the word God to him.' Ep 1334:440–1

394 The word *promerendum* (to be merited or deserved) is a rather unusual word to be employed in speaking of the Holy Spirit. One may well understand the misgivings of the monks. The passage in question is *De trinitate* PL 10 75A: 'Spiritus Sanctus expetendus est, promerendus est, et deinceps praeceptorum fide atque observatione retinendus.'

395 CWE 70 186 / ASD V-1 146:860–1. Jerome *Dialogus contra Luciferianos* 9 PL 23 172C. Lucifer, bishop of Cagliari (d 370 or 371), was a fierce anti-Arian who refused to acknowledge as bishops those who had come over from Arianism, a principle which led to the Luciferian schism. Erasmus is in error here. Jerome criticizes the Arians for believing that only the Father is true God, that Christ is a creature, and that the Holy Ghost is the servant of both, but does not himself say that Christ is a creature. He also confused the Hilary whom Jerome mentions with St. Hilary although he was uncertain about this identification, as he states (Ep 1334:598–603). Later, in 1530, he acknowledged his error and this passage was omitted from the Prologue of the revised edition of Hilary which Froben published in 1535.

396 In the word 'there' (*ibi*) the article refers to the preceding comment concerning Erasmus' work *On Praying to God*, which in turn harks back to Objection 19. The reference to the Prologue concerns specifically Ep 1334:430–68.

the holy Fathers, but expressly of Hilary, although it is probable that there were many like him. Nor do I speak of all his works, but of the twelve books he wrote on the Holy Trinity. But to leave room for calumny they made one writer out of many and of one work made additional ones. If Hilary at that time had discovered that it should be stated openly that the Holy Spirit truly should be called God and adored with the same worship, and was of the same substance (*ὁμοούσιος*) as those from whom he proceeded, since he was overtly treating of the three Persons, he would not have kept silent about such an important matter. And furthermore, in the Creed of the Fathers[397] that is sung at Mass the Son is declared true God from true God, the Holy Spirit is only called Lord, to be glorified and adored together with them; while in the later Creed, attributed to Athanasius, he will openly be declared God the Spirit, equal to the Father and the Son.[398] Why was it not declared in Hilary? Religious scruple was the reason because it had not yet been sufficiently discussed. Whence arose the confidence to officially declare it? From the comparison of the Scriptures and the authority of synods. Who is unaware that after the definition of the Fathers, Athanasius, Basil, Didymus, Cyril, Cyprian, Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine and with them many others wrote on the divine nature of the Holy Spirit? Am I so stupid as not to know this, or so unprincipled as to deny it? It was useless, therefore, for them to produce this list as if, of course, they themselves are used to dealing with such authors, and perhaps in the book from which they excerpted them the author reviews them for no other reason than to criticize them. I do not doubt that Hilary afterwards taught what we believe about the Holy Spirit. But it is sufficiently clear that at the time he wrote the books on the Holy Trinity he did not yet have enough information to pronounce on what was later defined. This much is certain: those who had doubts about the Son would have had more doubts about the Holy Spirit.

* * * * *

397 Ie the Nicene Creed

398 The so-called Athanasian creed, which strongly emphasizes the doctrine of the Trinity in opposition to the Arians, is no longer attributed to Athanasius. It is written in Latin and uses the exact terminology of Augustine's *De trinitate.* The sentences that most closely illustrate Erasmus' description are: 'The Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God. And yet they are not three Gods but one God.' Cf J.N.D.Kelly *The Athanasian Creed* (New York 1964).

RESPONSE 20. But I do not see what all the material they have compiled is leading up to. Nothing else is stated here than the religious scruples of the fathers and the religious custom of the church, which addresses its solemn prayers most often to the Father, sometimes to the Son, but never to the Holy Spirit. And yet, so that no one might suspect an inequality of Persons, I add that in each of them there is mention of all, and not content with this I add that 'it is not to be doubted that the Holy Spirit can be invoked.'[399] I merely indicate that the religious scruples of the ancient writers still exist in the rites of the church. I thought these things should be mentioned because now certain persons address their prayers to the saints, men and women, omitting Christ, contrary to every custom of the church.

RESPONSE 21. To respond in a few words to the last section: Hilary was earlier than Jerome and therefore more scrupulous in making pronouncement on divine matters. Jerome, in whose time all of these things had been discussed and approved at synods, with more daring called the Son a creature according to his divine nature.[400] I have no doubt that Jerome said this with pious intent, but this is not the place to discuss whether he spoke rightly or otherwise. I taught only what is probable about his religious sense, that he spoke of the divine wisdom, which is Christ, in the same way as did Athanasius, who sometimes suggests to the Greeks that he is said to be acquired (*κτᾶσθαι*),[401] not that he begins to be, or is created from nothing, but that he is prepared or destined for something. In this way we prepare a leader or a protector.

Lastly, lest they quibble about the word 'manifestly,' what is immediately manifest to one person is not manifest to everyone; and often what is not manifest at first sight becomes manifest on looking more carefully. And it is not a rare occurrence that one person sees what escapes another's attention. Thus it is that not everything was discovered that later was apprehended from the Sacred Scriptures by the scrupulous assiduity of many bishops.

You have a rough answer to the three points, devoid of all subtlety, from which it can easily be surmised what the other more trivial points were like, since these comments on matters of the greatest importance are so frivolous, not to use stronger language.

* * * * *

399 CWE 70 185 / ASD V-1 146:853
400 Erasmus misquotes Jerome, as is explained above in n395.
401 Athanasius *De decreto Nicaeanae synodi* PG 441D

Title IV
Against the Holy Inquisition of Heretics.

OBJECTION 22. 'In the *Paraphrase to Matthew,* chapter 13, "The servants who want to gather up the tares before the time is right are those who think that false apostles and heresiarchs should be uprooted from our midst by the sword and killed, though the master of the household does not want them to be killed, but to be tolerated in case by chance they might return to their senses and from tares be turned into wheat. But if they do not return to their senses, let them be saved for their judge, to whom they will pay the penalty some day."[402] So says Erasmus.'

RESPONSE 22. After displaying such a splendid example of inquisition, what else remained to them but that after the Most High Trinity was very well defended from calumny, they should come to the holy Inquisition of heretics. There is a great difference between a holy and a dishonest inquisition. A father inquires into the life of his son in order to take care of him; a doctor inquires into the health of a friend to heal him. So one who loves the house of God inquires into impious errors to heal them if he can, and if he cannot, after trying everything, he cuts off the incurable member so that the evil will not spread more widely. But others inquire in a very different way in order to betray. The man who buys up confiscated property inquires so that he can make fraudulent gains; the hanger-on inquires so that he can invent slander; the enemy inquires so that he can do away with someone; the tyrant inquires so that he can suppress public liberty; Satan also inquires, 'going about like a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour.'[403] From this type of inquiry the Christian inquisitor must distance himself as far as possible.

I think I answered this charge exhaustively in the *Supputationes ad Beddam*, proposition 32.[404] I also answered Latomus, who seemed to some to be censuring me indirectly, so that it is superfluous to repeat the same things here.[405] Every time I reflect within myself what cursed things heresy and schism are, I cannot condemn the branding iron of the law, harsh though

* * * * *

402 CWE 45 215 / LB VII 80E on Matt 13:28–30
403 1 Peter 5:8
404 *Supputationes* LB IX 580D-583F / ASD IX-5 350–8:134–302
405 *Apology against Latomus* CWE 71 38. The indirect censure refers to the same passage in Matthew but has little to do with the present discussion. Erasmus there expostulates: 'Where in my writings do I demolish so much evil that I damage what good remains, or sweep away so much chaff that I take the grain with it?'

it may be. Again, when I consider with what meekness Christ planted, nurtured, fostered, and put his church on a sound foundation throughout many ages, I can scarcely find a way to defend the example which we see today in some persons, who on the grounds of Scholastic opinions drag people off on the spot to prisons and the pyre, as we now see priests burnt alive who prefer to call the young woman with whom they are living a wife instead of a concubine. I usually try to remedy such situations, not to excuse them, and in this I am not accused of wishing that they go unpunished. I simply wonder how such severity can be consistent with the mildness of the church. It is not my role to approve or disapprove of the laws of worldly leaders; they have their law, they have their deliberations, they have their judge, to whom they must render an account. My paraphrase explains the sense of the Gospel parable. If it is true, if it is worthy of Christ, if it has gained the approval of orthodox interpreters, if it has been sanctioned for many centuries by the usage of the church, why is it censured? Or if it must be censured, why can they not also be brought before the law like everyone else? Until the age of Augustine, that is, more than four hundred years after the birth of Christ, we nowhere read that orthodox believers sought the assistance of Caesar against heretics, although that had frequently been done by heretics. Never did orthodox believers see fit to imitate this example until the intractable and incurable insanity of the Donatists and the Circumcellions,[406] too long tolerated, drove them to this. For besides the schism, than which there would have been no other more destructive if it had continued, they harassed, wounded and put out the eyes of Christians, throwing lime diluted with vinegar into their eyes, killing some and driving others to killing themselves for fear of death. They were no more merciful to themselves than to others, seeking death of their own accord by the sword, or if the sword was lacking, by hurling themselves from a cliff. Why should I elaborate? So great was their fury that they could not be tolerated either by pagan princes or by Christians, even if there was no charge of heresy or schism. Since there could be no peace because of them

* * * * *

406 The Donatists were members of a schismatic sect that flourished in North Africa in the third and fourth centuries who emphasized that the church of the saints must remain holy and that sacraments administered by lapsed clergy, especially those who had renounced their faith under the emperor Diocletian, were invalid. The Circumcellions, a more fanatic branch of the Donatists, were given this name because of their tactic of encircling and attacking dwellings near the tombs (*cellae)* of early Christian martyrs. They sought martyrdom themselves as the true mark of a Christian. For fuller information on these two sects see Ep 1895A notes 6 and 8.

nor any limit or end of their madness, finally there was a movement among the bishops to solicit the protection of the emperor against the intolerable wickedness of the Donatists. Those who were tolerant, among whom was St Augustine, did not approve of resorting to the secular power in an affair of the church, thinking that it was not fitting for bishops to use other arms than the word of God, prayers, and if the evil was incurable, anathema, that is, excommunication. At that time this was the ultimate punishment of the church, and just as among legal scholars exile is considered civil death, so among the apostles and their successors capital punishment consisted in being removed from association with the church. They were not only attracted to this point of view by the examples of Christ, the apostles, and the martyrs, but were also driven by fear, thinking there was a risk that if it was carried out by intimidation they would have counterfeit Christians instead of heretics, a greater peril for the Christian flock. But when the decision of the others won out and things turned out well after many had been corrected by this severity who either had remained unwillingly in that faction, or were ambivalent, or merely seduced by error, Augustine strongly approved what he had previously disapproved. But nonetheless, against frenzied thieves and murderers rather than heretics the law that was passed was too mild, in my opinion. First of all, it did not affect them physically nor did it deprive them of their possessions, but only transferred the possessions of the heretical churches to the churches of orthodox believers. If one wished to transfer his allegiance to them, he could have the usufruct of what he possessed previously and what he managed to acquire, with such leniency that their offices were not taken away from clerics and bishops who had a change of heart and only light fines were imposed on the rest who, few in number, were unwilling to repent. And thus no action was taken about doing away with such savage beasts so that when the edict of Macedonius, the provincial governor, if I am not in error, was proposed with such ambiguous wording that it seemed to threaten death to the heretics if they did not repent, Augustine warned him severely not to kill anyone, since this right did not exist in the imperial constitutions, and he praised him for having explained the verbal ambiguity in a later edict.[407] He also warned the tribune Dulcitius, among others, not to exact the death penalty.[408] From these examples it is clear how much their minds were averse to

* * * * *

407 Augustine *Epistolae* 153 PL 33 660–5

408 Augustine *Epistolae* 204 PL 33 939–42 / *Contra Gaudentium* 2.11 PL 43 749. Both Macedonius and Dulcitius were tribunes of Africa charged with the duty of enforcing imperial decrees against the Donatists.

the cruelty of confiscations, prisons, torture, and burnings, which nowadays finds too much acceptance and is the only recourse for many people. This is especially true of those who profess the perfection of Christian piety, whose sole energy should be to remedy rather than to kill and to mitigate the severity of the laws through their intercession. Now, violence exceeding the edict of emperors has been applied by these teachers of clemency. The edict of the emperor states: 'for those legitimately convicted.' It is of no importance to me how legitimately it is carried out at times, but to many this is not unknown. This class of men hardly obeys any law, neither ecclesiastical nor secular, but whatever they want is holy.[409] No heresy ever pleased me, nor have I ever favoured, favour, or will favour any heretic, except with the hope of healing him, so that no one may suspect that I say this for my own sake. I have never joined to myself anyone cut off from the sheepfold of the church, but standing firm with great constancy in communion with the church, I have called back some to its fold. I am only speaking of the cruelty of some whom it behoved to be more tolerant, even if princes threatened them with the sword and even if bishops in virtue of their authority exerted their power to incite terror in the wicked. Now, the opposite is taking place so that the authority of monks and prelates is compelled to curb their violence. For that reason the leadership in this task is usually delegated to princes of the church so that these men cannot do whatever they wish. The facts themselves proclaim what has been accomplished by seditious outcries among the people and the brutality of some persons.

Perhaps sometimes they write from a distant region to the prince to express their demands. He writes back, 'If this is the situation, let punishment be meted out.' With this answer their consciences are not liberated, but burdened. In addition, when a lay judge gives judgment based on their report, not on a knowledge of the case, the whole weight of judgment falls upon them. Now compare for me the leading bishops of the church with monks; compare the Donatist assassins with those who may have said in sermons that the spirit of Christ is more fittingly called upon than the Virgin Mother, or say that they doubt whether present-day confession was instituted by Christ himself, or whether priestly celibacy is a divine law. Compare the leniency of the imperial constitution barely granted by Theodosius with the severity of punishment now inflicted upon the ignorant, who have been induced to believe any and all errors, surely you will find in the punishments

* * * * *

409 *Adagia* IV vii 16

the absence of the compassion of the church.[410] 'But,' they say, 'afterwards a more severe law was passed with good reason.' I do not condemn the cauterizing iron, I am merely grieved that the sins of Christians have deserved such a harsh remedy. I am distressed at the punishment of parricides, but I allay this grief out of respect for public tranquillity. I feel the same way about those who, since they cannot be cured, must be done away with lest they infect others. Whatever the severity of the law prescribes, which is perhaps necessary, it is certainly the duty of priests and monks to strive to heal rather than to eliminate.

I have never expressed disapproval of the constitutions of princes, although it behoves them too to modify the rigour of the laws somewhat to suit the leniency of Christian moderation. There must be a wide difference between a pagan and a Christian ruler. Again, there is a great difference between a secular and an ecclesiastical prince. Lastly, there is some difference between a prelate endowed with public authority and a monk or theologian, whose duty it is to teach with all compassion. How is it that formerly, when no schools of theology had been established, the battle with heretics was waged successfully by the word of God alone, whereas now when the world is full of celebrated universities matters are settled only with articles and fascicles? What can be censured in the *Paraphrase* except that it makes no mention of a legal system of rulers that was invented in later years? It was not permitted that I have the evangelist speaking there, who did not know about that constitution unless I had to present him as saying this: 'For eight hundred years Christ did not want any heretic to be killed, but after that time another law will arise condemning them to be burned.' To imagine this speech given by me in these times would obviously be foolish since it is being spoken by an evangelist in the early days of the church. Nor does Christ talk about the sword of princes, although the church lived under pagan princes for so many centuries after the passion of Christ, but it speaks with apostolic zeal of bringing everyone to salvation with gentleness after the example of its first shepherd, who came not to lose souls, but to save them.[411] The result is that my interpretation does not interfere with the constitution of princes. For it teaches evangelical meekness but does not take away the right of the

* * * * *

410 Theodosius I, Roman emperor from 379 to 395, introduced legislation against pagan cults but was very lenient in enforcing it. See Alan Cameron *The Last Pagans of Rome* (Oxford, 2011) 59–74.

411 Luke 9:56; John 3:17

sword from the prince. It prescribes what was suitable for that time, not what the wickedness of man would require at the end of time.

Some laws of princes are issued to inspire terror rather than as an example to follow. And as it is the duty of the secular judge to draw the sword at times so that by the death of one person he may save many,[412] thus when error or chance or age excuses a crime and there is hope for correction, he must remember Christian forgiveness. It is also necessary to consider whether rulers have the right, on account of any crime whatever, to inflict capital punishment. We should also examine whether princes should be willing that for whatever error that may seem heretical a person be consigned to the flames. If the error is indisputable, there is no need of theologians, since the evidence is overwhelming; if it is dubious, it does not belong to just any theologian, but to the See of Rome to judge on dubious articles of faith. Much harsher is it to consign a man to the flames because of articles of faith that are not only dubious, but controversial or even frivolous. Much harsher still is it when the person is indicted for novel charges that they themselves invented at will, that is, offences against the Scholastic doctors, or suspicion or a matter of scandal, or against approved custom, or that sounds bad as it stands, or is said inappropriately, and numerous other charges of this kind, so that there is nothing that is not in some way exposed to scandal if a spiteful spirit intervenes. Yet in the meantime they dispute whether the church can establish a new article of faith, while these people, whenever it suits them, bring them forth in the process of the investigation and sometimes after the publishing of the verdict. The trial is conducted through clerks, deputies, and judges who are monks, not honestly or according to a legitimate form of law. Three priors pronounce sentence in prison, with two monks as witnesses, and the pyre is prepared. The prince, whose law serves as a pretext, knows nothing of this. A law that was issued for the public utility is made to serve the personal hatred of certain individuals. Since it was found out that these things were being done, princes had to be informed, but this information does not have to do with helping real, incurable heretics, nor does it weigh heavily on sincere inquisitors.

The constitution in the first book of Justinian's codex, under the title of the Manichaean and Samaritan heretics, section 8, orders only books and papers to be burned, only teachers to suffer capital punishment, and disciples to be fined ten gold pounds.[413] Those who not only attend lessons but even

* * * * *

412 Matt 26:51
413 *Codex Justiniani* 1 5 12

in contempt of the laws of princes possess their books, openly admitting their support of the heresy, it orders to be sent into exile. And this constitution does not affect any heretics whatsoever, but specifically Manichaeans, Apollinarists, and Samaritans who openly taught blasphemy.[414] The sections that precede this article are largely of the same nature. They order the Inquisition to extend its powers as far as capital punishment, but they specify certain heresies. Similarly, in the same book, under the heading of the Most High Trinity it specifies Arians.[415] But these heretics took away from the Son of God and much more from the Holy Spirit the truth of the divine nature, just as the Apollinarists denied that he was true man, divesting him of the better portion of man, the human soul. The Donatists were mad thieves, not merely pestilential schismatics. It was not a question here of whether confession was instituted by Christ, or whether the pure physical nature of man constrains him to sin, or whether the Creed was published by the apostles piecemeal, or whether the apostles were skilled in the Greek language, but concerning the majesty of Christ and the sum total of Christianity. In the constitutions of popes, which are in the *Decretals,* Book 5, under the heading 'On Heretics,' and in the sixth book, same number and heading, those convicted and persisting in their error, or who have relapsed into heresy after abjuring it are only ordered to be handed over to the secular arm, although the glossators on their own added 'to be burned.'[416] When was a fine prescribed for the Pelagians or the Jovinians in the imperial edicts?[417] Nowadays one who doubts whether the Roman Pontiff has jurisdiction over purgatory is dragged off to the pyre. And previously, in the synod of bishops, heretics who were brought to trial rendered an account of their teaching. If they were convicted, they had the free choice of preferring to pronounce anathema on their dogma themselves or to be stricken with anathema together with their

* * * * *

414 The Apollinarists were followers of Apollinaris of Laodicea (c 315–92). Their religion was a sort of Monophysitism, according to which Christ had but one nature, the divine and eternal Word of God.

415 *Codex Justiniani* 1 8 28

416 *Decretum Gratiani pars secunda* c 33 q 3 39

417 The Pelagians believed that man can take the initial step toward salvation by his own efforts without the help of divine grace. They denied the transmission of original sin from Adam. Pelagianism was first condemned at the Council of Carthage in 416 and definitively in 451 at the Council of Ephesus. Jovinian (died c 405) denied that virginity was a higher state than matrimony. He considered the exaltation of celibacy over marriage to be a negative, even Manichaean view of sexuality. Jerome wrote a particularly vitriolic attack against him, the *Adversus Jovinianum* in two books.

dogma, that is, to be excommunicated. This was the most severe punishment of the church in those times. Berengarius, who was not prosecuted concerning the origin of confession or of purgatory, but concerning the reality of the body of Christ, was not subjected to any physical punishment, although he had relapsed into the same error after being exonerated.[418] Nowadays monks spread vain rumours periodically, then they drag the person into jail as a suspect, there they argue in their manner, charges are recorded and fascicles are prepared. But these things are discussed outside a formal trial, in my case unnecessarily, but perhaps for others not without usefulness. Other examples may be found in the sources I have cited.

But suppose someone should allege that it is beside the point that I do not approve the law about killing heretics: what does that have to do with the holy Inquisition? In the age of Athanasius, Jerome, and Augustine was there not a holy inquisition, although no constitution about the burning of heretics yet existed? Since in the prologue that I prefaced to the *Paraphrases* I testify that I follow the commentaries of the ancient writers, it was fitting that I examine what they had argued on this passage.[419] And if they found out that my *Paraphrase* corresponded with the opinion of the Fathers, it was fitting that they should either grant me pardon together with them, or if they did not approve, condemn both them and me. I am not at all reluctant to tell you which doctors of the church I followed here. But first I shall warn the reader that this passage of the Gospel is variously interpreted. Some interpret 'uprooting the tares' as 'to kill,' others as removing the culprit from the company of the pious by anathema. Again, some understand by the word '*zizania*' ('tares') any criminals whatsoever, others only heretics and pseudo-apostles.

Finally, some think that this sermon pertains only to apostolic authority, which consists especially in teaching and spiritual authority. Others twist it to mean even secular teachers. But treating of evangelical philosophy is something quite different from discussing what God permits princes, whom he uses as his ministers of justice according to his ordinance, and sometimes even punishes his people through impious rulers. John Chrysostom, a man of piety and one very learned in the divine Scriptures, on Matthew, chapter

* * * * *

418 Berengarius of Tours (c 1000–88) taught that in the Eucharist there was no change effected in the material elements in the consecration. He was compelled to repudiate his teachings at several councils of the church, and was condemned most decisively at the Council of Rome in 1559.

419 Dedicatory letter to Charles V, CWE 45 6: 'In this work I have mainly followed Origen, the most experienced theologian of all, along with Chrysostom and Jerome, the most generally approved among the orthodox.'

13, Homily 47, interprets the parable of the Lord simply to mean that heretics should not be slaughtered, and he adduces various reasons for this interpretation. But lest anyone infer that heretics were given impunity by these words, he moderates his interpretation: He states: 'It does not prohibit breaking up the meetings of heretics, obstructing their mouths, and suppressing their courage to speak, but it forbids us to kill or slaughter them.'[420] Whoever wishes to read the rest of it may seek out the source I cited.

Theophylact is of almost the same opinion: 'The servants are angels who are indignant that there are heresies or malice in the soul and wish to pull out and cut away heretics and those who think evil thoughts from this life. God, however, does not permit heretics to be destroyed in wars lest the just suffer and be destroyed at the same time, etc.'[421] St Jerome interprets the pulling out of the tares to be the amputation of heretics from the church, saying: 'Lest perhaps in collecting the tares you uproot the wheat also. Allowance is made for penance and we are warned not to cut off our brother too quickly because it can happen that he who was led astray today by a harmful dogma may return to his senses tomorrow and begin to defend the truth.'[422] Yet here, since it was evident that Paul taught one thing and did another (for he teaches that we should not even take food with a brother who is a fornicator or is greedy,[423] and he himself handed over some to Satan),[424] he so tempers the interpretation that in manifest errors he does not want you to cut them off quickly, in doubtful errors never, but the investigation of such beliefs should be reserved for the Lord. 'Between the wheat and the tares, which we call darnel, as long as it is in blade and the stem has not formed the ear, there is a great similarity between them and there is no or very little difference to distinguish them. The Lord therefore instructed that we should not pronounce judgment too quickly when there is some ambiguity, but that we reserve the end to God the judge so that when the day of judgment arrives he will cast away from the company of the saints not the suspicion of wrong but a manifest misdeed.'[425] So spoke Jerome. I quote this commentary for the moment without approving or condemning it. It serves to illustrate that certain people should be ashamed of immediately making outcries of

* * * * *

420 Homily 46, not 47. John Chrysostom *Commentarius in Matthaeum, Homilia 46* (Matt 13:24–30) PG 58 477
421 Theophylact *Enarratio in evangelium Matthei* (Matt 13:24–30) PG 123 285
422 Jerome *Commentarii in Evangelium secundum Matthaeum* (Matt 13:29) PL 26 97C
423 1 Cor 5:11
424 1 Cor 5:5
425 Jerome *Commentarii in evangelium secundum Matthaeum* PL 26 97AB

'heresy, heresy, heresy' among the people without having read the book or understood the meaning, and those who criticize pious statements should be much more ashamed.

What use is it here to quote what men like Remigius, Anselm, and Bede think about this? I shall cite Augustine, the fountain and parent of all Scholastic theology, which those who create these farces chiefly vaunt. Although he gave his opinion on this matter in many other passages, he discusses the sense of this parable at great length in the book entitled *De quaestionibus evangelicis* on Matthew, chapters 11 and 12, adding to the commentaries of others that this parable pertains not only to heretics but to all who by leading a bad life are a scandal to the church. He also adds that the Lord's words 'Lest perhaps you root up the wheat also' refer not only to those who think and live piously, but to those who, converted to better things, can from tares become wheat. In a way he who takes out the bad which would become good eradicates the good. About killing evil people, moreover, he says: 'He did not say "At the time of the harvest I will say to you, 'Gather up first the tares,'" but he said, "But I shall say to the harvesters."' From this it is understood that it is someone else's ministry to gather up the tares and burn them, not that any son of the church ought to think that this duty pertains to him.' And a little further on, speaking of the pious man who is tempted to do away with heretics, he adds: 'The desire may spring up in a man's mind to remove such persons from human affairs if he has the opportunity to do so, but he calls to mind the justice of God as to whether he should do this, whether God commands or permits this and wishes this to be the duty of man. That is why the servants say: 'Do you want us to go and gather them up?' To whom truth itself responds: 'Man does not have the ability in this life to know for certain what kind of person each one will be afterwards. When he perceives an error in someone at the present moment,[426] or even what this error may contribute to the profit of the good, such men should not be removed from this life lest, when he tries to kill evil men, he kills good men, which perhaps they will be; or perhaps he will be a hindrance to good men, to whom, even though they be unwilling, these persons perhaps are useful. Rather it should be done when at the end there is no time left to change one's life or to advance towards virtue from the occasion and comparison with another's error. Then, however, it will not be done by men, but by angels. That is why the head of the household answers: "No, lest perhaps in gathering up

* * * * *

426 All the editions, including LB, have the reading '*cernis*' but I follow the text of Augustine, which has '*cernit*.' The narration continues in the third person.

the tares you uproot the wheat along with them. But at harvest time I shall say to the harvesters, etc." And in this way he made them patient and tranquil.' So wrote Augustine.[427]

You will say, 'From these words of Augustine it would follow that princes and magistrates have no right to stir up war or to kill any wicked person.' Yes, unless you interpret it as a son of the church performing his ecclesiastical duty, as bishops and theologians do. For the Lord seems to call servants specifically those to whom he has entrusted the care of the church and whose function he separates from the function of the angels. Many explanations have been contrived to explain this knotty question. It is a parable of the Lord, whose interpreter is the Lord himself. There is no hesitation about the authority, but there is ambiguity about the meaning of certain words. It could be said that this is a precept of the Lord pertaining to the beginning of the church when there were still few Christians living under pagan rulers. It could be said that they should not be removed if they wish to return to their senses, except that it was specifically added that the harvest stands for the end of time. It could be said that they should not be removed since from their death more evil than good would come to the church, except that here too it is not consistent with 'until the end of time, when all scandals will be removed.'

And if anyone is satisfied with this meaning, I did not pass it by. The words of the *Paraphrase* are in the person of Christ, not in my person: 'Therefore in the meantime the bad mixed in with the good must be tolerated since they are tolerated with less danger than if they were removed.'[428] It could be said that this can be taken as referring to dubious beliefs, except that this was said to the apostles, who were not lacking in a discernment of spirits, at least after receiving the heavenly spirit. It could be said that this parable pertains only to apostolic men, whose distinguishing mark is to protect the bride of Christ with the sword of the spirit, prayers, tears, an upright life, and blood, not with swords and bloodshed. I have followed this meaning since I saw no other solution to the question. In that way I do not detract anything from rulers, from whom God did not take away the sword, even if they were idolaters, and the apostle Paul also confirms their power.[429] Nor do I take away ecclesiastical power from apostles and theologians. It is very difficult to make the commands of princes and the profane laws of the public square conform to the standard of the church. They have the sword

* * * * *

427 Augustine *De quaestionibus evangelicis* 1.12 PL 35 1370
428 *Paraphrase on Matt* CWE 45 215
429 Rom 13:1

for revenge against evil and praise for the good, no one denies it. The impious have the same weapon but Christian rulers must be warned that only after having tried everything else, only in necessary cases should they draw the sword with great trembling, whether for war or for capital punishment, convinced that they must render an exact account to the King of kings for every action.

Theologians must be warned to distinguish simple error from impious dogma and one who simply goes astray, perhaps persuaded by his elders, from a malicious teacher of error. Finally, if they cannot eliminate the severity of the law, certainly they may mitigate it and be more eager to heal than to destroy, and they should not pronounce rashly on anything until they have carefully considered it. Lastly, let them ponder whether it is more expedient to remove certain heretics from the Catholic church or not to remove them. It would be advisable that they do not estimate the matter in light of their personal feelings and advantages, but by the utility of the Christian republic. They boast of the holy Inquisition. I shall admit that it is holy provided they so conduct the affair that it is worthy of the kind of men they wish to be considered. We should all be reminded that knowing that these sectarian tumults, discord among princes, pestilences, and scarcity of goods are sent upon us by an angry God, just as in former times he sent frogs, gnats, and locusts upon the Egyptians. First let us take refuge in his mercy and let everyone change his life for the better. In this way it shall come about that God will turn away his hand from us and will bend the minds of princes to the love of peace, whose implacable dissension, besides filling the world with every kind of calamity, nourishes this sectarian madness.

OBJECTION 23. 'Likewise, in the prologue to the *Paraphrase of Matthew* he says: "Every effort must be made so that no one slips back from his early faith. But if this cannot be accomplished, perhaps it will be more expedient that such a person is not compelled but is left to his own inclination until he returns to his senses, and in the meantime is not subjected to any other penalty except that he be prohibited from receiving the Eucharist and the other sacraments. He should not, however, be excluded either from the Mass or from the sermons."'[430]

OBJECTION 24. 'Likewise in the colloquy called 'Examination,' aside from the many things he says there in ridicule of the church's authority, speaking of

* * * * *

430 CWE 45 22

the excommunication of heretics, he said [Barbatius] "They issue excommunications, but their thunderbolts do no harm, and it is like lightning that comes from glass or a brass jar. [Aulus] "Yes, and this strikes terror into people too." [Barbatius] "Yes, but only children. God alone has a thunderbolt that can strike the soul." Then, in the person of another character [Aulus] "What if God is in his vicar?" Erasmus [Barbatius] answers: "Would that it were so!"[431] From this comment it can be inferred either that Erasmus does not attribute the power of excommunication to the pope, or he thinks that this power depends on *gratia gratum faciente,* both of which are heretical.'[432]

RESPONSE 23. This passage does not exist in the *Preface to Matthew,* but in the appendix added to the preface, to fill an empty page. We left it out in the next edition. I merely propose something for consideration; I do not assert anything. We answered this amply in the *Supputationes Beddae,* propositions 13 and 14 and do not wish to burden the reader by repeating the same things.[433]

RESPONSE 24. O holy inquisitions! In that colloquy I have Luther himself speaking under the name of Barbatius; in the person of Aulus it is I or any other true believer. If it was lacking in piety to say, 'They strike but their thunderbolts do no harm,' this could not be imputed to me, since I have the one who condemns papal excommunications speaking this line. Yet nothing impious is said here unless perhaps the pope cannot unjustly pronounce the sentence of anathema against someone. Barbatius feels that he has been

* * * * *

431 The full title of this colloquy is *Inquisitio de fide* (An Investigation Concerning the Faith). I have supplied the names of the speakers in the dialogue, who are not cited in LB, to make it more understandable. Barbatius is Luther and Aulus is Erasmus, as he will tell us in his response. The excommunication referred to is the papal bull *Exsurge Domine* issued 15 June 1520 by Pope Leo X, condemning Luther and threatening excommunication and anathema if he did not recant. The last line spoken by Barbatius (Luther), 'Would that it were so,' drew criticism from Erasmus' enemies, who accused him of casting doubt on papal powers. In the end Barbatius is cleared of the charge since Aulus fails to find any heresy in him. Cf CWE 39 423.

432 *Gratia gratum faciente* is grace that heals and sanctifies the person who receives it, as opposed to *gratia gratis data*, which is given to one person not for his own sanctification but for the sake of the community. Thomas Aquinas *Summa theologiae* Question III 1–5

433 *Supputationes* LB IX 557F–563B / ASD IX-5 5 305–15:37–302

excommunicated without cause. Erasmus, or another true believer, answers him that not even a false decree of anathema can be despised. Certainly this is also terrifying. These are also Luther's words: 'Yes, but only for children.' The following words are spoken by me: 'What if God is in his vicar?' indicating that the sentence was justly pronounced by the pope and by God through his vicar. Luther responds: 'Would that were so!' Here they have reversed the characters and shamelessly made Barbatius into Erasmus, while the facts themselves reveal this lie. What is more senseless than for me to introduce myself as one suspected of heresy, which not even heretics do? What they piece together follows from my words as night follows from the rising of the sun. Barbatius says nothing save that he has been excommunicated without cause. The one who says this is not speaking of the authority of the pope, but of the quality of an action, and Erasmus teaches that such a thunderbolt should not be scorned by pious men. What they add about *gratia gratum faciente* is so stupid that they seem to be joking. Shall I not disdain to give a response? Barbatius does not mean that the pope can do nothing in his office unless he has the spirit of Christ, but he indicates that he excommunicates in vain a man who has committed no crime. This is very true even if the speaker in the dialogue would be rightfully excommunicated, although the speaker feels that he has not been excommunicated. Here you have another example of the holy Inquisition.

Title v
Against the Sacraments of the Orthodox and Catholic Faith against Baptism.

OBJECTION 25. 'In the argument of the paraphrase to 1 Corinthians he said: "While today we think it is sufficient just to be dipped in a little bit of water in order suddenly to become a Christian."'[434]

OBJECTION 26. 'And in the colloquy that he calls "The Religious Feast": "And once it is received (ie baptism) he is called and in some way is a Christian boy."'[435]

* * * * *

434 CWE 43 20

435 *The Religious Feast* CWE 39 196. The speaker also says there that after the sponsors have given their money the boy is called a Christian, but only after a fashion because he will only become truly Christian by attaining newness of life.

OBJECTION 27. 'Likewise, in the Prologue to Cyprian he said: "But if the question depended on human reasoning and if general agreement did not deserve to be supported everywhere, the view followed by Cyprian might well be preferred to the received view."'[436]

OBJECTION 28. 'And in the prologue to the *Paraphrase on Matthew* in a certain way he teaches that baptism must be repeated.'[437]

RESPONSE 25. Here the sacrament of baptism was at risk unless the holy Inquisition came to the rescue. To dismiss the matter in a few words, the general name of Christian is given to all those who have been baptized, so that this word also includes heretics, apostates, and parricides. But true Christians are those who respond to the sacrament by a newness of life. A great part of Christianity is missing to those who receive the sacrament without the grace of the sacrament. I therefore teach what Paul, Peter, James, and John teach: that those who are buried with Christ in baptism will rise again with him into newness of life, laying aside the old man with his deeds and putting on the new man.[438] Is he who teaches this speaking against the sacrament of baptism? So they accuse me in what precedes this: 'It is such an arduous task to be transformed into another person – from those conditions in which you were born and to which you have long been habituated.'[439] Then I criticize certain men of our times to whom it seems enough to be dipped in water, paying no regard to those things without which baptism leads not to salvation but rather to damnation.

RESPONSE 26. In the *Colloquy* I criticize certain people who, content with the sacraments, do not care for the matter of the sacraments, and beginning with baptism I continue to extreme unction, confession, and the other sacraments. Therefore, the question here is not whether a baptized child is truly

* * * * *

436 Ep 1000:148–51. Cyprian believed that those baptized by heretical Novatian priests had to be re-baptized for admission to the church. He was supported by the African bishops in three councils held in 255 and 256, as is made clear in the Acts of the Synod of Carthage, which Erasmus appended to his edition of Cyprian.

437 CWE 45 20 / LB VII **3v. Here Erasmus suggests that those who were baptized as children upon reaching adolescence should attend sermons and publicly renew their baptismal profession of faith.

438 Rom 6:3–4; Eph 4:22–4; Col 3:9–10

439 CWE 43 19–20

a Christian, but this beginning is compared with other stages. If nothing more can be added to a baptized child, why does he receive instruction afterwards and is fortified by the other sacraments to a perfect Christianity? A child truly baptized is a Christian to this extent, that grafted onto the body of the church he is saved by the goodness of God, which compensates, through the faith of the church, what is lacking to his time of life, but these things would not be sufficient for him should he arrive at the age of adulthood. In adults baptism is not perfect Christianity unless in addition to the sacrament they receive the grace of the sacrament, but it is a beginning and initial stage of Christianity because this spiritual generation has its infancy, adolescence, and fullness of age and its stages of life, through which according to Paul we grow to the measure of the fullness of Christ.[440] Also in Hebrews 6 he says: 'Therefore, leaving behind the basic teaching about Christ, let us go on towards perfection, not laying the foundations again: repentance from dead works and faith in God, instruction about baptism, etc.'[441] And he gives birth again to the Galatians, still little children, nourishing them with milk until they grow up.[442] Those who are baptized without the reception of grace or who have lost it because of an evil life are Christians in name and in the sacrament, but are not truly Christians because they are not the disciples of Christ nor are they possessed by him but by Satan, according to Luke 14: 'Whoever does not carry the cross and follow me cannot be my disciple.'[443] Again, according to Paul: 'Whoever does not have the spirit of Christ does not belong to him.'[444] In children the sacrament has such power that, if they should die in infancy, it is sufficient for them for salvation, and if they have grown up, there is no need to be baptized again. In those who have received it in an evil frame of mind, as a heretic from a heretic, or through perverseness of will have lost the grace of baptism, the sacrament has the power for them to return into the living society of the church through penance equivalent to a second baptism without having to be baptized again. Christians who live a bad life are said not to be Christians, just as in the Gospel Jews are said not to be the children of Abraham (John 8:39),[445] and in Paul Jews say they are not Jews.[446] Is it impious to teach that those who have been baptized and enjoy the honour of

* * * * *

440 Eph 4:13
441 Heb 6:1
442 Gal 4:16
443 Luke 14:27
444 Rom 8–9
445 John 8:39
446 Rom 2:28

the name of Christian should strive to act appropriately to the sacrament and the name? We have taught such things in many places, something I have in common with all true believers, with the apostles, and with Christ.

RESPONSE 27. I have answered this in response to Béda among the things from my writings that he marked out for criticism.[447] First of all, I think it is a pious thing to submit the opinion of my mind to the authority of the church, and to give more importance to that than to human reasons and arguments. What I said there about the repetition of baptism that is given by heretics can be said of other dogmas of the church.

RESPONSE 28. I responded amply to this calumny of Béda, first in the *Divinationes* in answer to what he had criticized from the appendix added to the *Paraphrase of Matthew* 13, 14, 15,[448] and in the *Supputationes,* propositions 13, 14.[449] There is no discussion either there or anywhere about repeating baptism, a thought that never entered my mind even in a dream, but about renewing catechism, or rather receiving catechism.[450] For today infants are baptized without a true catechetical instruction. If praise is given to the church because water is publicly consecrated among some persons and the people are sprinkled, when at one time some used to be baptized by aspersion since for reasons of health they could not support the action of dipping; if it is allowed that certain people today pour a great quantity of holy water on the tombs of the dead, what difference would there be if some of these ceremonies were renewed after catechism, as they are now performed among the Germans after each sacred function? Nevertheless, I do not teach this but I propose to bishops and pastors for their consideration whether it is proper for these or similar things to be done. Catechism is necessary; if there is a more suitable method, let my advice be a fantasy. So far am I from teaching that baptism should be repeated that I say openly that it is not permitted to repeat it. These are my words: 'First of all, let it not be supposed that baptism can be repeated, which is not permitted.'[451] But they cleverly added 'in a certain

* * * * *

447 *Responsio ad notulas Bedaicas* LB IX 484AB / ASD IX-5 129–30:686–95
448 *Divinationes ad notata Bedae* LB IX 459A–F / ASD IX-5 68–9:308–55
449 *Supputatio* LB IX 557F–61B / ASD IX-5 305–12:36–201
450 Erasmus returns to this conviction at the end of the *Paraphrase*: 'But let no one think that to obtain salvation it is enough once to have been baptized and to have professed the gospel faith; the baptized must again be taught how they can preserve their innocence, in what ways they are able to advance to the perfection of gospel holiness.' CWE 45 379
451 CWE 45 21

way.' I agree, but we are renewed in some way when we are sprinkled with holy water. And the monks almost equate their profession with baptism, and the water is not lacking.

Against Confession.

OBJECTION 29. 'In the *Annotations* to the Acts of the Apostles, chapter 19, he said: "But confession, which is now received in secret and aurally, seems to have arisen from the private consultations that usually take place with bishops, if some scruple is oppressing the soul."[452] Also, in the book *On the Manner of Confession* he said: "Secret confession arose from the consultations with bishops."[453] He testifies the same thing in the *Apology against Zúñiga*.[454] Also, in the book *On the Manner of Confession* besides the fact that he seems to discourage rather than encourage confession, he gives many incorrect opinions about the circumstances.'

OBJECTION 30. 'And in the colloquy called "Shipwreck" he openly makes fun of confession.'

OBJECTION 31. 'And in the scholia to the Epistle of St Jerome to Fabiola, tome 1, folio 89, he says: "From this passage you can notice that confession was once public and concerning known offences; satisfaction was public also, and it appears in Jerome's time the secret confession of offences had not yet been instituted."'[455]

RESPONSE 29. I have responded many times to this charge, first to Lee to his new annotation 15,[456] and again to Zúñiga 14.[457]

On the sacrament of penance there is no controversy between us; the question is only about confession. Certain people call it sacramental, which I do not deny. I accept confession as it now exists with all its circumstances, that is, with the things that pertain to the suitable priest, to the cases reserved

* * * * *

452 Acts 19:18 LB 508A / ASD VI-6 297–8:713–15
453 This statement is found neither in the 1524 edition nor the revised 1530 edition of the *Exomologesis*. The Spanish monks must have either confused it with the preceding annotation of Acts 19:18 or they made it up.
454 *Apologia ad conclusiones Jac. Stunicae* LB IX 389CD / ASD IX-8 278–80:441–68
455 *Omnium operum Divi Eusebii Hieronymi Stridonensis* Tomus primus (Basel 1516) fol89v. (Copy in the Folger Shakespeare Library.)
456 A long dissertation in *Responsio ad annotationes Lei* ASD IX-4 292–303 / CWE 72 362–77.
457 See n454 above.

for bishops and the supreme pontiff, to the necessity of confession, to the enumeration of kind, species, and circumstances, and other things of this nature.

I do not affirm that it was not instituted by Christ, but I say that it seems to me to have been instituted by the Fathers when occasion offered, although I observe it and teach that it should be observed reverently as if it were instituted by Christ. I have not been able to teach that it was prescribed by Christ because I have not yet been sufficiently instructed to prove this; when I shall be, I will profess that also. Nor do I think that the church has decreed that we believe that this confession, as we now have it, was handed down by Christ. I see nothing in this that deserves reproof. But both in what I answered to Lee and in the *Exomologesis,* if anyone should read it, he will find that there are many honorific things said in commendation of this confession. At the same time I testify that I gather together some disadvantages so that they may be avoided, which I admit do not come from the thing itself, but from human vice. Nowhere in that work do I call them disadvantages of confession, as I speak of advantages, but I call them evils that arise from human vice when there is opportunity for so much good. This is how I begin my list of disadvantages: 'Now is the moment to say a few words about the evils that seem to occur on the occasion of confession, but they occur because of the vice of man, not of the thing itself.'[458] The reason I do not teach here that confession was instituted by Christ is that I was not able, I did not undertake to do so, nor was it expedient for certain reasons at that time even if I could have done so. At any rate, that little book, as I have discovered, corrected many people who were already thinking of shaking off the burden of confession, so far was I from discouraging anyone. If I had any such intentions, even the common people know what crimes, what disgraces, what monstrous practices certain people perpetrate, disguising themselves under the appearance of sanctity through the opportunity of confession, practices so apparent that scarcely anyone from the ranks of the common people does not have stories ready to tell. It was not my concern to reveal such things. I would rather have others look to it, so that they will not be so widespread. I merely wished to give warning about some things that are done wrongly and with improper judgment in this matter. I say many things in my answer to Lee that make it sufficiently clear that I have pious views on confession if it is performed properly.

* * * * *

458 *Exomologesis* ASD V-8 366:373–4 / CWE 67 37

RESPONSE 30. In the colloquy 'Shipwreck' confession is not ridiculed either covertly or overtly, but it narrates the facts as they happened, or what usually happens is such confusion.[459] I do not have to reply to this section. I am surprised that they do not bring up the colloquy 'On the Confession of a Soldier' while they are at it, if they think that whatever is said by any character in the *Colloquies* in jest or in earnest pertains to a matter of faith, and that I must answer for it.

RESPONSE 31. I admit that these words are in my scholia, but they should have added what I added there: 'confession, which afterwards the church beneficially instituted, provided that priests and laymen use it properly.'[460] These are the words not of one who disapproves of confession, but who professes that it has been usefully prescribed by the church.

OBJECTION 32. 'And in the book, *On the Manner of Confession*, he said: "The meticulous review of the kinds and species of your sins and the circumstances leading to other kinds of sins distracts the mind away from the love of God and begets hatred and despair."'[461]

RESPONSE 32. Anxiety is an immoderate solicitude that torments many people in confession, whether because of the fragility of their age or sex, or because of ignorance or because of the mental vice of being prone to pessimism. Those who are experienced in hearing confessions know what I am talking about. I do not think it is less pious to dispel immoderate fear from such penitents rather than to strike terror into the exalted and the arrogant. I do not doubt that all good priests do this, and the more pious he is the more diligently does he act in this way. But if it is pious to do it, it is pious also to recommend that it be done. The therapy of penance is not used so that a man may always feel anxiety and be sad, but that joy should succeed temporary anguish and love should succeed terror. For according to John fear has nothing to do with love, but love casts out this kind of fear.[462]

* * * * *

459 Very little offence is given in this colloquy. There is merely the scene of an old priest who gives a sermon from Gerson on five truths concerning the benefits of confession. CWE 39 357

460 Scholia of the Epistle of St Jerome to Fabiola. See n455 above.

461 ASD V-8 372:491–3 / CWE 67 42

462 1 John 4:18; 'There is no fear in love, but perfect love casts out fear. For fear has to do with punishment, and whoever fears has not reached perfection in love.'

Now besides the law of the church, how many scruples and snares have certain Pharisees added, who reap a very rich profit from this bird-catching, and constantly add new snares, as if their aim was that no one at all would have a tranquil conscience while they themselves would have a completely free conscience? How many do we see dying in anxiety, fearful, and almost in despair because they are not sure whether they left out any circumstance from their confession? I think it is an act of piety and Christian charity rather than heresy to teach these things.

If anyone will peruse my works he will find that this kind of confession is often proclaimed by me as salutary and necessary.[463] I never encountered any pious and sensible man who approved the other anxious and frequently repeated kind, an examination rather than a confession. I never asserted that it was not instituted by Christ; I merely indicated my suspicion, and I would gladly lay it aside when someone either proclaims a definite decision of the Catholic church or convinces me with suitable testimonies and arguments of Scripture. This is not aimed at hatred for confession, but rather is in its favour, if it can be demonstrated that it was instituted by Christ, just as it does not exhibit a hatred of confession to point out the vices of some persons who abuse confession, especially when at the same time remedies are indicated whereby these things can be avoided. And today Scholastic theologians do not deny that confession was instituted by recent fathers of the church, as far as 'accidents' are concerned, to use their language,[464] so that some things can even be changed, for example, that we may confess to any priest you please and only every five or ten years, or even twice a year, etc.

On the contrary, certain persons in books published expressly on this subject seem frankly to have doubts about confession, whether it was handed down by Christ, or mentioned in the divine Scriptures, or enjoined by canon law through a general ordinance of the church according to a certain gloss which exists on penance, distinction 5, at the beginning. And yet that gloss does not indicate that it was a general constitution since it admits that the Greeks were not bound by it, and it is not probable that a universal constitution of the church would not have reached them in so many years.[465]

* * * * *

463 *Exomologesis* ASD V-8 348:31–5 / CWE 67 20

464 In the philosophical sense of properties not essential to a substance or object.

465 Gratian *Decretals* 2, c.33, q.3, distinction 5. The *Glossa ordinaria* was added to the *Decretals* in 1210–17 by Joannes Teutonicus. For an analysis of Erasmus' views on confession see John B. Payne *Erasmus: His Theology of the Sacraments* (Richmond 1970) 181–229.

Against the Eucharist

OBJECTION 33. 'In the prologue to the *Paraphrase* on 1 Corinthians he said: "How concise is his mention of the Eucharist or synaxis,[466] as if he were afraid of saying something that he ought not to say about such a great mystery."'[467]

RESPONSE 33. From these words, I beg of you, what can be inferred against the Eucharist? I say that Paul spoke concisely, that is, with few words about such a venerable mystery, and I do not say that he was afraid of saying something that he ought not to say, but as if he were afraid. This is shown in the words, 'I received from the Lord what I have transmitted to you.'[468] He maintains this same religious scruple also in less serious matters: 'Concerning virgins I have no command from the Lord.'[469] There is no impiety in wishing to be taught with more wealth of words from Paul on certain subjects, even if only to be better prepared to answer those who contest it. If this is an impious feeling I admit that I have often had it and never confessed it as a sin.

I declared my feelings about the Eucharist in a book published expressly against those who with supreme shamelessness tried to persuade the ignorant that I had the same feeling about the Eucharist as has been recently taught by certain people who disagreed with Luther, who despite distorting everything were not able to find a single credible passage of the many that express the Catholic opinion.[470]

* * * * *

466 Erasmus commonly uses this Greek word, which literally means an assembly, for the celebration of the Eucharist. He also used it to refer to the celebration of the Lord's Supper as the communion with Christ. He elaborates on the meaning of the term in *Modus orandi* ASD V-1 125:138–40 / CWE 70 153: '… the same act is called *synaxis* by the Greeks, that is, the process of being brought together, because at the same time the bonds of love among all members of the body of Christ are therein represented. Consequently, it is also called *communio* "communion," in Latin.'

467 It is not a prologue, but a dedicatory letter to Erard de la Marck, Bishop of Liège, CWE 43 4. These words were criticized on several occasions by Noël Béda. See *Divinationes ad notata Bedae* LB IX 472C–D / ASD IX-5 99–100: 38–53, *Elenchus in N. Bedae censuras* LB IX 506B–C / ASD IX-5 188:565–79, *Supputatio* LB IX 676B–677C / ASD IX-5 538:708–24.

468 1 Cor 11:23

469 1 Cor 7:25

470 The book was the *Detectio praestigiarum cuiusdam libelli germanice scripti,* usually referred to in English as *The Uncovering of Deceptions,* published in 1526. It was Erasmus' answer to *Des hochgelerten Erasmi von Roterdam unnd Doctor Martin*

OBJECTION 34. 'In the *Spongia,* letter f, Erasmus says that whether the Mass can in any way be called a sacrifice is not an article of faith, and he would not want to risk his life for this nor execute anyone if he were the judge.'[471]

OBJECTION 35. 'And in the annotation to Mark, chapter 14, he said: "Those who so vehemently assert what words Christ used for consecration, although nowhere do we read this specifically.'[472]

OBJECTION 36. 'And on 1 Corinthians, chapter 11,[473] "This is my body" he said: "In all things we must submit to the judgment of the church although this phrase seems to be spoken by one distributing bread that has already been consecrated."[474] In general,[475] it seems wiser to me in matters of this kind, which cannot be demonstrated by definite testimonies of Scripture but depend on human conjecture, not to assert them so strongly that we demand that our opinion be considered oracular. Perhaps it is safer that leading men of the church should not pronounce rashly on anything whatsoever that cannot be demonstrated, since they too are men and can fall into error."'[476]

RESPONSE 34. Concerning what they allege from the *Spongia,* either they did not understand it or they have maliciously perverted it. It is true that I answer Hutten on that point, who reckoned it as a fault in me that I would not expose myself to all dangers because of Luther's teaching, adding that I would be willing to be a martyr for Christ if he would give me the strength, but I would not want to be a martyr for Luther. Luther thinks that one must face a thousand deaths rather than admit that the Mass is a sacrifice. I would not wish to risk my life for his conviction; on the contrary, I admit that the

* * * * *

Luthers maynung vom Nachtmahl unnsers herren Jhesu Christi (The *Opinion of the most learned Erasmus of Rotterdam and Martin Luther concerning Our Lord Jesus Christ's Supper)*, a pamphlet published in April 1526 by Leo Jud, a colleague of Zwingli in Zürich, in which he tried to show that Erasmus and Luther essentially agreed with the Swiss in their views on the Eucharist. Cf the introductory note to the work by John B. Payne in CWE 78 148–62.

471 *Spongia* ASD IX-1 190:642–5 / CWE 78 122

472 *Annot in Marcum* 14:24 ASD VI-5 424:893–4

473 1 Cor 11:24

474 ASD VI-8 230:296–8 9 (1516 edition)

475 LB has *totum* for *in totum*.

476 ASD VI-8 230 app crit. This is the text of 1519–1522. It was removed in the 1527 edition.

Mass is a sacrifice, although not in the same way in which Christ consummated a true sacrifice on the cross, and I disagree entirely with those who contend that the Mass should be abrogated. Therefore, what is said there is not aimed against the Eucharist, but is in favour of the Eucharist, as in the words that follow: 'Regarding those issues that are usually the subject of debate, etc.'[477] But if it were a principal article of faith that the Mass is not a sacrifice, as Luther contends, death would have to be both inflicted and faced for its sake. I do not like those people who drag men to the pyre for any articles whatsoever. Those who do so do it at their own risk; I would not wish to do so. Furthermore, I call articles of faith those that have been handed down in all the creeds the church recites, even if I do not object to the association of this word with certain dogmas that are not explained there. And as regards the reasons why the Eucharist is called a sacrifice, it is still disputed among theologians, as there is much dispute about the primacy of the pope, what is its nature, whether it is superior to a universal council or not.

RESPONSE 35. It is not yet apparent to me that the church has expressly stated that Christ consecrated with these words, 'This is my body,' and 'This is my blood,' even if it is established that this form of consecration was handed down to us by Christ, and even if it seems quite probable to some that he consecrated with a blessing according to species. Not even Thomas or the more recent Gabriel concealed the fact that there were various opinions of theologians concerning this matter,[478] even of orthodox theologians, of whom none declares that it is heretical to have doubts about this, and they do not present any other author who affirms this except for Eusebius of Emesa,[479] an author of no little renown, if the words that are quoted in the *Decretal of Consecration*,

* * * * *

477 CWE 78 122 / ASD IX-1 190:643–5. The passage continues: 'exercises in the faculties of theology.' Erasmus is being somewhat allusive here. The passage he quotes has little to do with the Eucharist *per se*. It merely mentions the institution of the Eucharist together with other theological opinions that are not articles of faith but are reserved for debate exercises in faculties of theology.

478 Thomas Aquinas *Summa theologica* 3 q.75 art. 1 and 78 art. 1; Gabriel Biel *Canonis misse expositio* Lectio 36 Pars 2 ed Heiko Oberman and W.J. Courtenay (Wiesbaden 1965) 42–4

479 Eusebius of Emesa, in Syria (c 300–59), a student of Eusebius of Caesarea, was a man of exceptional learning, a scriptural exegete of the Antiochean school. A commentary on Genesis, originally written in Greek, is extant in an Armenian translation as well as thirty of his sermons, translated into Latin. Thomas Aquinas mentions him in the *Summa theologiae* 3 q 75 art. 3.

distinction 2, 'Because the body' are his.[480] What sin is there if I advise the reader to examine that passage more carefully, and if he does not find anything better, I indicate how it can be justified. I say that this passage can be justified through the figure of *hysteron proteron*,[481] for Christ could also have consecrated the bread and wine into his body and blood without those words.

RESPONSE 36. Since I said at the beginning that in all things we must submit to the judgment of the church, even if human understanding and the outward appearance of the Scriptures disagree, I make it sufficiently clear that I will immediately obey if anyone demonstrates to me what the church has pronounced on this, and if it has clearly pronounced on it I will approve what the church decided, even if I do not yet know what it has pronounced. The leaders of the church are theologians and bishops, who in my opinion would act more safely in all matters that have not been clearly expressed in the Scriptures if they do not readily assert with such authority that what they consider probable be regarded as an oracle. We are not speaking here of general synods but of individual theologians and bishops. And if anyone would suggest that all those assembled in a synod should not pronounce rashly on anything whatsoever, I think he would not be acting with impiety. For there are things on which it is not necessary to pronounce. There are things on which it is permitted to be uncertain, and this is one of those about which I am not yet certain, without any harm to the authority of the church. And to admit it frankly, while I have never been at a loss concerning the words of consecration, yet I have often wished for something more certain that we could answer to the contentious besides the authority of theologians and the church. As far as the substance of the body is concerned, we have sufficient knowledge to oppose them, but not so in the form of the words. The reasons that Thomas and other theologians present here are not strong enough not to be rebutted. What shall we say when the same words are not found in the

* * * * *

480 Gratian *Decreti tertia pars de consecratione* Dist. 2 c. 35, *Corpus iuris canonici* 1 ed Aemilius Friedberg (Graz 1959) 1325

481 A figure of speech in which the logical order of ideas in the narration is reversed. Erasmus uses the synonymous word *πρωθύστερον*. He explains this also in the *Detectio praestigiarum* (The Uncovering of Deceptions): 'Mark (14: 23–5) reports the words in such a way that they seem to have been pronounced in the consecration of the cup *after* the apostles had drunk.' ASD VI-5 424:893–9 / CWE 78 182. On the use of this figure by Erasmus and Karlstadt see G. Krodel '*Prothysteron* and the Exegetical Basis of the Lord's Supper' *Lutheran Quarterly* 12 (1960) 152–8.

Greek liturgy? And in Epistle 59 among the many prayers that are used to bless what is on the altar, Augustine mentions the Lord's Prayer as the conclusion of the entire consecration.[482] And it is probable that the ancients did not dispute anxiously about what were the closing words of consecration, but after everything that is usually done in the consecration, which, if I am not mistaken, they called the blessing,[483] was completed, it was certain that it was the body and blood of the Lord. The prelude to the blessing is when the priest, going toward the people, greeted them, 'The Lord be with you,' and invited them to contemplate the Eucharist, not look upon it with the eyes: 'Lift up your hearts, let us give thanks, *εὐχαριστῶμεν*,' he said, that is, 'Let us give thanks to the Lord our God.' The rest of the preface seems to have been added by later writers, 'It is truly meet and right, etc,' as also the once popular canticle of doxology: 'Holy, holy, holy.' Then, with all the people remaining outside, only the priest with the deacon performed the mystery of consecration, and when this was done, again in procession, he invited the people to communion, saying, 'The peace of the Lord be with you.' Then he broke the body of the Lord for distribution, and when this was over a prayer followed, which even today is said after the communion. Again there was a giving of thanks and the blessing of the people. Of these things that we can piece together from Augustine there are clear vestiges even today. But this is beside the point. It is not a question here of what words the priest uses to consecrate, but with what words Christ consecrated.

OBJECTION 37. 'And in the letter to John Šlechta of Bohemia, while he was treating of the error of the Bohemians who communicated under both species, contrary to the resolution of the church in a council, he says: "And yet, to say frankly what I think, I wonder very much why it was thought right to alter what was instituted by Christ, since the reasons they bring forward do not seem of much weight."[484] From these words it is evident that Erasmus does not profess a firm and unshaken faith in the councils and decrees of the church and resembles Luther himself in this matter as in many others.'

RESPONSE 37. In the very words that they quote from my letter what else can be concluded but that I do indeed yield to the authority of the church, but the

* * * * *

482 In the *Patrologia Latina* this letter is numbered 149. PL 33 637
483 Cf Josef Jungmann *The Mass of the Roman Rite* 2 (New York 1986) 185.
484 Ep 1039:133–5

reasons they allege do not satisfy me in every respect. In the age of Augustine and, as it is to be inferred, much later, it was the custom that the Eucharist be given under both species even to children, in which case there was more danger that some of the liquid could be spilled or be regurgitated by a child, as happens when they do not like something that they have swallowed. I wished, therefore, that more serious reasons be presented in a matter of such great importance, and yet I withhold my meaning in obedience to the church, if others are not given. This is stated in my words that immediately precede that passage: 'And yet in this matter if the Bohemians had sought my advice, I would have told them that even if their opinion on this question may well be true, nevertheless, they should comply rather than dispute it, especially as the greatest part of Christendom follows this custom.'[485] Likewise, a little before this: 'And in this matter, as it seems to me, the second faction is more at fault in rejecting contumaciously the jurisdiction and tradition of the Roman church rather than in thinking it is a pious practice to receive the Eucharist under both species.'[486] Such were my words. It is fitting that there be very strong reasons to persuade us that against the ancient practice of the whole church, against the tradition of Christ, against the authority of Scripture, they should deprive the laity of one half of the sacrament. I have no doubt that they have reasons, which perhaps because of some obstacle they have preferred to suppress. It is not impious *per se* to communicate under both species. Otherwise both the Greek and the Latin church would have committed an impious act for a long time. The fact that it was changed is the result of a human constitution. Furthermore, the less I know about the reasons for this innovation the more praiseworthy is the obedience I show to the church, although these people educe the opposite.

But if they say it is not permitted to examine the reasons for pontifical constitutions, they must condemn Thomas, Scotus,[487] Durandus,[488] and in-

* * * * *

485 Ep 1039:130–3

486 Ep 1039:125–8

487 John Duns Scotus (1266–1309), surnamed the *Doctor Subtilis,* was an immensely learned and prolific Franciscan philosopher and theologian. Among his most important works are his *Reportata Parisiensia,* his commentaries on the *Sentences* of Peter the Lombard, on which he lectured in Paris, his various commentaries on the works of Aristotle, and the *Quaestiones quodlibetales* on theological questions and debates.

488 Durandus of Saint-Pourçain (c 1275–1332), was a Dominican theologian who lectured on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard at the University of Paris and produced three separate commentaries on them, in which he frequently opposed the views of Thomas Aquinas.

numerable other theologians. About my resembling Luther in this and many other things, if I answered that this is a manifest lie, they would find me lacking in moderation, but curses on the fraudulent book from which these accusations were excerpted! I recommend that they obey the constitution of the church of Rome in the receiving of the Eucharist. Is this to resemble Luther? Let them read what he writes about this matter. And where are these many things they mention, when right from the start they are lying in one of them?

Against the Sacrament of Ordination

OBJECTION 38. 'Likewise, in the *Compendium of Theology,* letter c, and in the *Annotations* to Matthew, chapter 16, he seems to attribute priestly authority to the entire people when he says: "There is no one in the body of Christ of whom this confession is not required, 'You are Christ, the Son of the living God.' Similarly, what is said to Peter: 'You are Peter and upon this rock I shall build my church, and I shall give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven' pertains to the body of the whole Christian people.'"[489] These are his words.'

OBJECTION 39. 'And in the *Response to Zúñiga,* where he is criticized for this, he confirms the same thing.'[490]

OBJECTION 40. 'In the paraphrase on Matthew 16 he seems to understand that the keys of the church are unanimity of wills, and he says other things worthy of censure.'[491]

RESPONSE 38. So far am I from disapproving the fact that the Roman Pontiff is held as the head of the church in all its extension that, even if it had not been instituted, I would recommend that it be instituted as necessary to exclude or control dissension and repress the tyranny of some persons, provided

* * * * *

489 *Ratio* ed Holborn 198:2–8

490 *Apologia ad blasphemias* LB IX 365B–D / ASD IX-8 140–2:457–69

491 *Paraphrase* Matt 16:18–21, 'Surely these are the keys that I will give to Peter when he confesses me … Although that power especially suits the leaders, nevertheless I will give it to everyone, provided only there is consensus – not human consensus, but consensus in my name.' CWE 45 266. For the central place of 'consensus' in Erasmus' ecclesiology see James McConica 'Erasmus and the Grammar of Consent' in *Scrinium Erasmianum* ed Joseph Coppens (Leiden 1969) 2 77–99.

the pope remember that this power was given to him for the building up of the house of God, not for its destruction, and that this rule is evangelical, not worldly; paternal, not kingly; that his armour is chiefly the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God; the shield of faith, the helmet of salvation, the belt of moderation, the shoes of the preaching of the Gospel, arms, I say, for God, more powerful than troops and artillery.[492] I could quote innumerable passages from my writings in which I attribute a power to the Roman Pontiff that is equaled by no man on earth. I say that he takes the place of Christ on earth. I call him the leader of the whole church, and other things that to some seem excessive, and I have continuously submitted myself and my writings, whatever their worth, to him as to a supreme judge. I merely confess that at times I have doubted whether such great power was given to Peter by Christ, or whether it was later given to the Roman prince by the consensus of princes and bishops. I never asserted that it did not come from Christ, but I was always more inclined to the other alternative. The reason for my doubts were the works of ancient writers, which often do not seem to attribute to Peter the supremacy that the Roman Pontiff now possesses. From these passages I sometimes noted down some things from which it can be inferred that this power either did not exist in the days of the early church, or was not recognized or not exercised. If I had collected only these passages I could seem not to be kindly disposed to the primacy of the supreme pontiff, but since I also take note of those things that seem to grant to the Roman Pontiff the supremacy of the whole church, it is clear that my aim was nothing other than to supply material for discussion for those who inquired into this matter. Now, having read the writings of others and weighed the matter more carefully, I am even more favorable to this view and would support it heart and soul, and applaud it with all my enthusiasm if I saw that all that power served the glory of Christ in all respects, which now at times seems to be largely diverted to the affairs of the world at the cost of the church and Christian piety. Therefore, I have either removed or corrected some passages in my writings on this subject.

With this preamble I come to the passages cited. They seem not to have understood the passage in the *Methodus*, which is less grave than to criticize what one has understood. I point out that the same man in Scripture at one

* * * * *

492 Eph 6:14–17. The 'troops and artillery' could well refer to Pope Julius II, the 'warrior pope.'

time plays the part of one person and at another time another part, as a result of which different meanings arise and nothing forbids various meanings of one passage as long as they do not contradict one another. The passage in the *Methodus* says this: 'When Christ asks his disciples, "Who do you say that I am?" he is playing the part of the head. Peter in the voice and person of the whole Christian people answers: "You are Christ, Son of the living God, etc"[493] and it is entirely true that there is no one in the body of Christ who does not profess this. And whoever professes this becomes himself also Peter, that is, solid as a rock for Christ. It does not follow that if according to this meaning this is the profession of the whole church, therefore the Roman Pontiff is not the head of this profession since when the person is changed the meaning is also changed, although not to the contrary. According to the same meaning whatever is said to Peter is said to the whole Catholic church, which is the body of Christ.'[494] 'You are Peter, etc' that is, your profession is solid and upon this profession I shall found my church in the whole world, and to that church I shall give the keys of the kingdom of heaven, etc. There is no doubt that outside the church there is no remission of sins, but only in the church, which has the Spirit of Christ, even if the minister of the keys lacks the Spirit of Christ. But that is not to say that the Pontiff is not the first minister of the keys if the power of the keys belongs to the universal church. However, in this section I do not report my opinion, but add that this is the interpretation of orthodox believers. But it never came into my mind, not even in a dream, that priestly authority is present in all Christians whatever. And yet Peter wrote to all Christians, 'You are a chosen race, a royal priesthood.'[495] And whoever sacrifices the goat of lust to God, as priest immolates an acceptable victim. I sometimes ascribe this race of priesthood to all Christians, but I am not the only one.

RESPONSE 39. Zúñiga, I admit, criticized this passage in his *Blasphemiae*,[496] and I do not answer there what these persons infer, but I make the same answer I just gave. These are my words: 'Is the Roman Pontiff, therefore, not the highest doctor of the faith because faith belongs to the whole church? Or

* * * * *

493 Matt 16:15–16
494 *Ratio* ed Holborn 197–8:33–8
495 1 Peter 2:9
496 Cf n489.

does he not, therefore, have the supreme right of the keys because the consensus of the whole church has that same right?'[497] Otherwise when a pope dies, whence comes the right of the keys in the church? Not that I am defining whether the universality of the church is above the pontiff. So their claim that I say the same thing in both places is twice groundless since in neither place do I say what they interpret.

RESPONSE 40. But what they infer from the *Paraphrase* is clearly groundless since there I openly attribute the supremacy of the church to Peter in these words: 'To you I will consign the keys of this heavenly kingdom, that is, of the whole church, for it is fitting that he who is first in the profession of faith and in charity should be first in authority.'[498] And further on: 'Accordingly, he who is still bound by sins belongs to the kingdom of the lower world and cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven. He will enter, however, if having professed in your presence what you profess, he will be loosed from his sins by baptism and thus with you as his guide and with you unlocking the door, he will enter into the kingdom of heaven. It is my special power to forgive sins, but I will impart this power to you in some measure so that, having received my keys, what you loose upon earth will be loosed also in heaven before God, etc.'[499] You see that no mention is made here of the consensus of wills, but of the primary power of the keys entrusted to Peter, which it is agreed he who is like Peter in faith and charity will have, but I did not say necessarily. Here also you have an example of the holy Inquisition, but what does this have to do with the accusation? Would there be no rank in the church, neither of priests nor of deacons, nor of subdeacons, nor of bishops nor archbishops if the Roman Pontiff were not head of the whole church? For so many thousands of years the world had no universal monarch, nor does it have one yet, nor will it ever have one, if I am not mistaken, yet republics do not fall to pieces. From this you can deduce their wisdom.

Against Marriage

OBJECTION 41. 'In the *Annotations* to Matthew, chapter 19, "Furthermore, as to what they repeat in the schools today that marriage is contracted by

* * * * *

497 *Apologia ad blasphemias* LB IX 365C / ASD IX-8 142:464–7
498 CWE 45 247
499 Ibidem

consent alone,[500] if only that were as well observed as it is accepted."[501] So he says here.'

OBJECTION 42.[502] 'And he says worse and more dangerous things than these commenting on 1 Corinthians 7, where he tries to argue that the church would do well if it would dissolve a consummated marriage for many reasons and give those who are separated the right to marry again.'[503]

OBJECTION 43. 'And in the Colloquy 'The Girl with no Interest in Marriage' he says: "Some people claim that a marriage between a boy and a girl that has been contracted through the *verba de praesenti* (to use their term) is regarded as valid even when the parents are ignorant of it or even opposed to it. But this belief is approved neither by common sense, nor ancient laws, nor by Moses himself, nor by evangelical or apostolic teaching."[504] Such are

* * * * *

500 What Erasmus says here is ratified in both Roman and canon law, beginning with the maxim of Ulpian (*Digest* 23 1 4), and continuing with Gratian *Decretals* 2, c 27, q 2, c 1. Cf also Peter Lombard *Sententiae* dist. 27, 3, 1: 'Efficiens causa matrimonii consensus.' In fact, church jurisprudence at that time equated the minimum age required for marriage with the age of puberty, so that it was possible for a girl at the completion of her twelfth year and for a boy at the completion of his fourteenth year to wed validly even without the knowledge of their parents. This law was supported by Thomas Aquinas *Commentarium in IV libros Sententiarum Magistri Petri Lombardi,* book 4, dist 38, q 1, art 1, quaestiuncula 3, solution, 3, ad 2. Although marriages were usually performed in the presence of a priest who would bless the couple, neither he nor any witnesses were necessary for the legality of the union.

501 Matt 19:5 ASD VI-5 264:831–2

502 *Annot in 1 Cor* 7:39. At this point the numbering of objections and responses in LB differs from all the editions. Objection 42 is not considered a separate objection and in this way LB has a different numbering from here to the end. I follow the numbering of all the early editions.

503 ASD VI-8 158:1000–4

504 *Colloquies* CWE 39 292. It is difficult to see what is so impious about these words. Erasmus illustrates through the male character in the dialogue, Eubulus ('good counsellor' in Greek), that the new marriage laws in the church abrogate what was sanctioned by the law of nature, taught in the Mosaic law, approved by the law of the Gospel and confirmed by apostolic teachings. By the simple pronouncing of certain formulas, expressed in the present, not the future tense, a marriage was validated. Aquinas discusses valid and invalid formulas in *Supplementum* q 43 art 1, and a list of acceptable formulas is provided by Guillaume Durand in his *Speculum iudiciale* (Basel 1563) 413–14. As he says openly here, Erasmus was totally opposed to this practice, which led to

his words. This is a statement of such impiety that no one, not even a semi-learned person, would be able to tolerate it.'

OBJECTION 44. 'Whoever wants to know what Erasmus thinks about the bond of marriage or about divorce, what he adduces for his decisions on this subject and how dangerous it is, let him read the annotations to 1 Corinthians 7. He will hear him in seven pages of this book vehemently arguing against the universal church on this subject.'[505]

OBJECTION 45. 'And in general, against all the sacraments he says in the *Enchiridion*: "Piety does not consist in any visible thing"[506] although according to Augustine a sacrament is a visible form.'[507]

RESPONSE 41. "On marriage I have made answer so many times to people like Lee[508] and Zúñiga[509] and several others that it is useless to repeat so many of the same things. He who wishes that marriage be entered into among Christians in a holier manner than is now done is not acting against marriage but for the sake of the dignity and stability of marriage. I admit that it is an established practice, but they will say that it is by the authority of the church. Let us grant this, and we have never dissolved a marriage. But what fault do I commit if I wish the pontifical constitutions to be explained to me? Do not Scotus, Thomas, and Durandus frequently inquire into these matters? And it is nothing new that the Roman Pontiffs change certain things in their decrees, even concerning the sacraments.

* * * * *

clandestine marriages. In his *Institutio Christiani matrimonii*, first published in 1526, he fulminates at great length against this abuse, exposing the ambiguity of the various formulas and legal distinctions. It seems that the Spanish monks were either unfamiliar with this work or purposely ignored it.

505 *Annot in 1 Cor* 7:39 ASD VI-8 144–90, a veritable dissertation on the subject of the bond of marriage and divorce.

506 CWE 66 65 ASD V-8 180:247–8. In the fifth rule of the *Enchiridion* true Christianity is defined in this abstract language: 'that you establish firmly in your mind that perfect piety is the attempt to progress always from visible things, which are usually imperfect or indifferent, to invisible,' which the inquisitors twist to their own purpose.

507 Augustine *De civitate Dei* 10.5 CCSL 47 277. This phrase is not in Erasmus' annotation.

508 ASD IX-4 304–14 / CWE 72 377–92

509 *Apologia ad Stunicae conclusiones* LB IX 389F–390B / ASD IX-8 280:475–506

RESPONSE 42. The annotation of 1 Corinthians 7 with legitimate protest and with great respect proposes to the leaders of the church whether in some way some thought be given to the rashness of those contracting marriage and the unhappiness of those who are badly joined together, especially since the Roman church has defined many things that were previously left ambiguous; in some cases it has rescinded former decrees, as we have shown in this commentary. The Roman Pontiffs Innocent and Zosimus and Augustine judged that children were damned unless they received the Eucharist after baptism, as is evident from many passages of the letters of Augustine and of books he wrote to Boniface and against Julian,[510] and there is no doubt that all of Africa observed this, as Augustine shows, and all of the western church, as Innocent shows. Today we see that both the opinion and the practice have been completely abolished, presumably after thorough investigation. The authority of the church does not immediately collapse if it either changes things for a time or subjects them to more careful scrutiny, which is what happened in the case of matrimony.

RESPONSE 43. It is a fine state of affairs if whatever is said in jest or in earnest by every character in the *Colloquies* is attributed to me. If they produce an example either from the customs of pagan republics, or from the books of Moses, or from the Gospels, or from letters of the apostles, in which approval is given to marriage contracted *per verba de praesenti* or *per verba de futuro* and sealed by carnal relationship between those who have barely reached the age of puberty, between drunks through the wiles of brothel-keepers, with no ceremonies of betrothal, no witnesses, without the knowledge or consent of their parents or guardians, I shall admit that what was written

* * * * *

510 Augustine quotes Pope Innocent I as saying that baptized children must receive the Holy Eucharist in order to be saved, *Contra Julianum haeresis Pelagianae defensorem* PL 44 1 13 647. Pope Zosimus I, who succeeded Innocent I in 418, at first rescinded the decrees of his predecessor denying baptism to newborn infants but later reissued them. Augustine mentions this also in *De peccatorum meritis et remisssione et de baptismo parvulorum,* 1 20 27 and 1 24 34, PL 44, 124 and 128–9. This belief came from an interpretation of John 6:53: 'Truly, truly I say to you, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you.' It was the practice of the church in Augustine's time that the priest's index finger, which had been dipped into the wine, would be placed into the infant's mouth. Erasmus refers to this belief in his annotation to Rom 5:12. See the note in CWE 56, 149 and n68. The reception of communion under both species is still the general practice of the Eastern Orthodox Church, but in the West it had disappeared by the thirteenth century.

in the *Colloquies* is against religion. But if these and many other things are of human institution or subject to human interpretation, why can what has been instituted not be instituted differently? Or can the church, which has narrowed the limits of contracting marriage, not broaden them again if it wishes? And where do we read in the Scriptures *verba de praesenti* or *verba de futuro*, and the addition of carnal relationship, and many other things which lawyers discuss in this regard? But these things have been amply discussed by me elsewhere. Who are these semi-learned individuals who cannot tolerate such impiety? Or are the semi-learned more impious than the learned?

RESPONSE 44. Again and again I ask that they read that passage carefully. If it is read it will answer for me that I do not argue against the church, but under the judgment of the church, seek to help members of the church, and I point out how this can be done, without any harm done to papal authority, far from my attempting to undermine it.

RESPONSE 45. What they add from the *Enchiridion* is of such a nature that I am ashamed to answer, although they do not specify a passage. The *Enchiridion* teaches that true piety is not found in visible things, that is, food, clothing or ceremonies, among which are included also the sacraments of the church. They construct this syllogism: 'A sacrament is the visible form of invisible grace (although they did not quote this definition fully or correctly). But Erasmus writes that piety is not to be placed in any visible thing. Therefore piety is not to be placed in the sacraments.' I admit it, but the *Enchiridion* adds 'in them only,'[511] openly teaching that neither ceremonies nor the signs of the sacraments are to be despised. But if whoever receives the sacraments of baptism, or the Eucharist or extreme unction, or any of the others has piety, then Erasmus has spoken impiously. But if no one says this except an impious person or a heretic, let those who condemn pious words be silent. Let this also be an example of the holy Inquisition.

If I had simply said that true piety does not exist in things capable of being apprehended by the senses, first of all it was not necessary to distort this to refer to the sacraments, which are not among the usual number of visible things. Then they should have recognized the recurrent figure of speech in Holy Scripture. Christ said, 'The flesh is of no use,'[512] obviously under-

* * * * *

511 CWE 66 71 ASD V-8 192:424–5: 'I commend them for embracing the "flesh" of piety, but I do not commend them for going no further.'

512 John 6:63

standing the flesh without the spirit. Paul said, 'Knowledge puffs up,'[513] meaning knowledge without charity brings forth conceit. Now since in so many passages, even in the *Enchiridion* itself, I approve of external ceremonies perceived by the senses, if what is essential exists as well, there was no opportunity for criticism. Of the many passages one comes to mind from the fifth rule. I say: 'I would have had scruples to say "It is of no profit"; it would have been sufficient to say: "The flesh is of some profit, but the spirit is much more profitable." But Truth itself said: "It is of no profit."[514] Indeed, it is of so little profit that according to Paul it is fatal unless it is referred to the spirit.[515] In other respects the flesh is useful in this sense, that it leads our weakness to the spirit by degrees.'[516] I speak of the Mass a little further on: 'Perhaps you go to Mass daily but you live for yourself and are not affected by the misfortunes of your neighbour. Then you are still in the "flesh" of the sacrament. But if in going to Mass you are conscious of the meaning of that partaking, etc.'[517] A little later concerning those who attend Mass, but in a superstitious manner I say: 'I commend them for embracing the "flesh" of piety, but I do not commend them for going no further. Let what is represented there to the eyes be enacted within you.'[518] And later: 'Sacrifice yourself to him who once offered himself for you to the Father. If you trust in him without reflecting on these things, God will hate your flabby and gross religion.'[519] And I pursue this subject in the whole rule, never condemning the ceremonies of the church, but indicating what should be added and warning those who trust in the sacrament but neglect the spirit.

Against the Authority of Sacred Scripture, the Evangelists, and the Apostles

OBJECTION 46. In the annotations to Matthew, chapter 2, in the third edition Erasmus manifestly lapses into error,[520] if one considers the matter with

* * * * *

513 1 Cor 8:1
514 John 6:63
515 Rom 8:13
516 CWE 66 69–70; Holborn 72 18–24; ASD V-8 190:386
517 CWE 66 70–1; Holborn 73 25–8; ASD V-8 192:414–16
518 CWE 66 71; Holborn 74 3–5; ASD V-8 194:424–5
519 CWE 66 71; Holborn 74 9–11; ASD V-8 194: 429–31
520 Not the third edition, but the second, 1519. The verse in question is Matt 2:6, which contains the prophecy of Micah, 'And you, Bethlehem, in the land of Judah, are by no means least among the rulers of Judah,' which differs greatly from the

Christian piety, not content with the implications of the words. For he contends that even the evangelists erred and had lapses of memory. He likewise asserts that one error in Sacred Scripture does not detract from the authority of all the Scriptures.'[521]

RESPONSE 46. To demonstrate that I have responded to this point I ask nothing else but that they examine the passage. There is no manifest lapse of Erasmus there nor does he contend that the evangelists erred or had a lapse of memory, but in reply to fastidious and impious calumniators he proposes on behalf of the authority of Sacred Scriptures that even if the writers had erred in the order of events or the memory of a name, or any other similar matter that does not properly pertain to the Christian faith, all of Scripture would not immediately collapse; otherwise it would have already have totally collapsed since even in the most correct manuscripts lapses of this sort are found. And what I acknowledge here Jerome says more than once.[522] But that I do not make this the subject of contention is proved by my words: 'And I have said these things, gentle reader, not because I wish to be the author or defender of this idea, but so that if perhaps there are some who think that difficulties of this kind, some of which Jerome discusses, cannot be explained, they will not immediately conclude that because of one or two little words the authority of all of Scripture is shaken, etc.'[523] This was interposed to appease the quibblers. Then I add: 'If this expedient is not accepted, I prefer to believe that the passage was corrupted either by the Hebrews or by us, or if what was changed was changed for the better by divine wisdom or, finally, that the Scripture was genuine but our intellectual weakness did not grasp the mystery, etc.'[524] But you see how far this is from a contentious statement.

* * * * *

original wording. In a very brief annotation in the 1516 edition Erasmus mentions Jerome's *Commentarius in Michaeam* (CCSL 76 481) and citing it indirectly, says that what Matthew wrote does not correspond either with the Septuagint or the Hebrew bible, which he attributes to a lack of memory. In the second edition he cites the entire passage from Jerome, and in addition refers to his Epistle 57 to Pammachius, entitled *De optimo genere interpretandi,* in which he specifically discusses this passage from Micah, showing that it is a free translation *ad sensum*, still retaining the original meaning. Present commentaries agree with Jerome and Erasmus.

521 *Annot in Mt* ASD VI-5 100:840

522 ASD VI-5 98:763–70. Jerome *Commentarius in Michaeam* 2 5 1–2 CCSL 76 481

523 ASD VI-5 100:837–41

524 ASD VI-5 100–1:842–6

All the while these people cannot distinguish between an error in a word and in an idea. It is generally agreed that the evangelists transmit the meaning of the prophets in different words.

It could have happened that the Holy Spirit allowed them to be mistaken in words, or perhaps he wished them to have lapses of memory, as long as the meaning remained intact, since he preferred to have it explained in different words. Closely related to this is the matter of the author's name. If we accept this overcritical approach, there will be the same collapse of authority in the books of both Testaments, since there are no copies that agree in every respect. And yet as far as my understanding is concerned, I favour more the opinion of those who believe that in the canonical Scriptures, at least, the apostles did not err in meaning or in word.

If someone should ask what necessity there was for broaching these matters, the subject itself suggested it and the authority of Jerome and, much more, that of Augustine, whose testimony we introduced above.[525] And the unrelenting calumny of certain people drove us to it, since apart from that not even a fly would have made a noise. Now since the study of languages is disregarded and no care is given to reading, and not even the copying of manuscripts is taken into account, and so many things are confused and corrupted in the sacred texts, they do nothing else but din into our ears the authority of the church and the Holy Spirit as the author of the Scriptures. But they should have exercised vigilance then and there when everything was being corrupted with impunity while they were disputing about instances and relations. They should have taken care then and there that what was handed down through the Holy Spirit would not be vitiated by the rashness of scribes; now they raise outcries too late against those who try to restore Scripture to its pristine purity.

OBJECTION 47. 'And at Matthew 27 he says, "But these words 'upon whom they set a price' are not in Jerome nor in Jeremiah nor in Zachariah, but they were added in the person of the evangelist. I bring these words out into the open, leaving it to the judgment of the reader. But even if there had been a lapse of memory merely in the name, I do not think anyone should be so exacting as to say that for that reason the authority of all of Sacred Scripture

* * * * *

525 Erasmus' memory must be failing him here. The reference to Augustine's *De consensu evangelistarum* concerning the occasional errors of the evangelists follows rather than precedes the present statement. See below n529.

is shaken."[526] So he wrote. And at Mark, chapter 1, he says: "Then when they (ie the evangelists) carelessly excerpted what had been written by the Hebrews but wrote down what their memory suggested, they sometimes differ in wording."'[527]

RESPONSE 47. In their quotation from Matthew 27 the first words are not mine, but are recorded there from other authors and have nothing to do with what is being discussed here.[528] What follows does not attribute error to the evangelists but making use of a supposition, 'If there were a lapse of memory merely in the name of the prophet,'[529] I mean that the Christian's faith must be such as not to repudiate all of Scripture on that account when it is generally agreed that the apostles both were ignorant of certain things and made mistakes in others, even in things that pertain to faith if we are to believe Augustine,[530] and this is not to detract from their sacrosanct authority. I do not affirm this, but I say 'I think,' and furthermore, I said previously that I do not believe that such a thing happened in the Gospels. These are my words: 'It seems probable to me that in the Greek manuscripts the name was changed through a scribal error, and therefore the Latin translator was deceived and transmitted to us what he had read.'[531] As far as I am concerned, I do not think there is anything of this sort in the Evangelists. And after all the other opinions I add a new one by which the evangelist can be excused: a person who continues to believe when the supposition of such an error is made believes all the more when the supposition is removed. And he who does not believe what he invents for the sake of persuasion is far from the contention which these people devise.

* * * * *

526 Matt 27:9 ASD VI-5 334:637–42. The words 'not in Jerome' are not in Erasmus' annotation.

527 Mark 1:2 ASD VI-5 356:110–12. Erasmus added *'in sententia concordant'* (they agree in meaning), which was omitted by the Spaniards.

528 As a matter of fact, the words his accusers quote from the annotation are a summary of various opinions he has discussed taken from Origen, Jerome, and the *Glossa ordinaria*, not his words at all. He refrains from giving any definite judgment of his own, but his sources are unanimous in claiming that the prophetic words, *quem appreciaverunt* (on whom a price had been set) were from Zachariah (Zach 11:12–13), not Jeremiah (Jer 32:6–9). This is a very complicated problem of scriptural exegesis, which is still debated today.

529 ASD VI-5 334:640

530 Augustine *De consensu evangelistarum* 3 7 29 CSEL 43 126

531 ASD VI-5 334:628–30

OBJECTION 48. 'And in the *Apology to Lee* at Mark 1 he said: "The man is merely upset because I left undecided the question whether the evangelist put one name for another because of a lapse of memory. I changed the wording of my annotation in the second edition on the advice of the excellent theologian Maarten van Dorp. And I changed it not because I thought the wording was impious but because I wanted to remove any occasion for giving offence.'[532]

RESPONSE 48. I say nothing different in my response to Lee. I do not assert, but I say that I think so, and I do not admit to thinking that the evangelists made a mistake in the name lest someone challenge me on this, but that if something like that existed, it was not necessary to lose confidence in all of Scripture. I say that this opinion does not seem impious to me, even if it is false. And in that same place I add that I do not believe what some have inferred and what Jerome reports as ambiguous. These are my words: 'Yet I prefer the opinion of those who deny altogether that the apostles and evangelists suffered a lapse of memory to those who occasionally blame them for it, especially in written works.'[533] What was said about a mistake in a name can also be said of the order of events, about which Jerome speaks ambiguously. At any rate, it is evident that in words and in the order of words they are sometimes at variance both with the Septuagint and the Hebrew text.

Now consider this: who has a more excellent opinion of the Sacred Scriptures, he who does not lessen his trust in their reliability even if in places the order of words and events or the name of the author is not consistent, which, however, I do not think is so, or one who if he comes upon a slip of one word immediately mistrusts all of Scripture?

There are some things in the letters of the apostles that are not necessary for salvation, as when Paul orders that the cloak he had left in Troas[534]

* * * * *

532 ASD IX-4 106:936–41 CWE 72 111. The passage is not from Mark 1 but from Mark 2:26. The confusion arises from the apparent substitution of the name Abiathar for Ahimelech (as found in 1 Sam 21:2–9). In the 1516 edition Erasmus offered three explanations: a lapse of memory, a scribal error or the Hebrew practice of giving different names to the same person. He omitted the first possibility in 1519 on the advice of Martin Dorp (Ep 304:150–6). He mentions also that the Latin manuscripts give Achimelech and the Greek Abimelech. ASD VI-5 368:418–19. The problem still remains unresolved.

533 CWE 72 112

534 A Hellenistic-Roman city and port located on the Aegean Sea near the entrance to the Dardanelles

be returned to him.[535] Let us suppose, which is not the case, that he had a lapse of memory, thinking that he had left his garment in Troas, which he had left somewhere else, is the authority of all of Scripture to be immediately rejected or should we rather say that the Christian faith is not at risk because of a garment?

Nor should the error, if there was one, immediately be attributed to the Holy Spirit, but to human nature, whose capabilities and actions the divine Spirit so directed that they had a treasure in clay vessels.[536] And perhaps the fact that the evangelists differ occasionally in words, opinions, and organization is an artifice of the Spirit to strengthen our faith. Finally, this hypercriticism rebounds onto the authority of the manuscripts we now possess, if anyone should doubt that some work is either missing or superfluous or one name is put for another.

I have pleaded my case and I have explained what I expressed in my published writings. I have already spoken of Jerome, who proposes two meanings in such a way that he calls neither of them impious.[537] But in his books *On the Consensus of the Evangelists* how often St Augustine attributed forgetfulness and recollection to them; how often he perceived a difference between the order of their recollection and the order of the events themselves; how often he says that something that had occurred much earlier came into the mind of the evangelist later, but did not occur to him at that moment. He does not think we should reproach the evangelists because they explain the same thing in different words and different figures of speech. An example of this is when in one evangelist John the Baptist says that he is not worthy to carry the sandals of Jesus[538] while in another he says that he is not worthy to untie the thong of his sandals.[539] Augustine says that this is not important since each one proclaims the pre-eminence of Christ in his own way.[540] Here is a similar case: Matthew so reports the words of the Father as if they are addressed not to Christ, but to the Jews: 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased';[541] Mark, as if they are addressed to the Son: 'You are my beloved Son, with you I am well pleased.[542] Augustine says that in passages

* * * * *

535 2 Tim 4:13
536 2 Cor 4:7
537 Jerome *Commentarii in Matthaeum* 4 27 10 CSEL 77 264
538 Matt 3:11
539 Luke 3:16; Mark 1:7
540 Augustine *De consensu evangelistarum* 2.12 CSEL 43 129
541 Matt 3:17
542 Mark 1:11

like this there should be no suggestions of a false statement since the sense is the same.[543] The same writer in Book 3, chapter 7 of this work, treating the question of the testimony that Matthew cites from Jeremiah, although there is no such passage in this book but in Zachariah, affirms that the passage that has the name of Jeremiah seems to him to be the true and genuine reading, and he is not afraid to attribute it to a human lapse. I shall record his own words, in which he quotes the opinions of those who extricated themselves from this problem by saying that in some manuscripts Zachariah was written in place of Jeremiah, in others there was only the word 'the prophet,' without any mention of the name, to which Augustine adds: 'Whoever so pleases may use the defence. I do not like it because many manuscripts have the name of Jeremiah, and those who have made a careful examination of the Gospel in the Greek manuscripts say that they found it in the older Greek manuscripts and there was no reason why this name should be added so that there would be an error. Certainly there was a reason why it was removed from some manuscripts, that it was the result of daring ignorance when there was a heated discussion about this testimony not being found in Jeremiah. What else are we to understand but that this was done by the secret design of God's providence, by which the minds of the evangelists were governed? It could have happened that Jeremiah instead of Zachariah occurred to the mind of Matthew as he was writing the Gospel, as often happens, which he would emend without hesitation if this was drawn to his attention by others who could have read this while he was still alive, except that it was not without reason he thought that it had occurred to his mind, which was guided by the Holy Spirit to write the name of one prophet instead of the other, because the Lord ordained him so to write,'[544] and other things of the same substance. Augustine wrote this and he did not correct it in the *Retractationes.* Likewise in his discussions concerning Matthew he says this of the evangelists: 'For each arranged the narration that he began not altogether according to the order of events but according to his own powers of recollection.'[545] In chapter 13 of *On the Consensus of the Evangelists* he treats similar matters and thinks that the variety in words and in the order of events is of benefit both to exercise the understanding of the pious and to lead the impious into a wrong understanding. A man of such piety and learning discusses these matters not to lessen the authority of the evangelists but to dispell the calumny of

* * * * *

543 *De consensu evangelistarum* 2 14 CSEL 43 131–2
544 Augustine *De consensu evangelistarum* 3 7 29 CSEL 43 304–5
545 ASD VI-5 336:654–5, *De quaestionibus evangelicis* 16 in Matt 14 CCSL 44B 138

untruthfulness directed against the evangelists. For the Holy Spirit has so directed the understanding and memory of the evangelists that forgetfulness also contributes to our good, while each one narrates what took place in a different order and each one expresses his opinion in a different way. Let them suppose that I felt the same way as did Augustine, why should they say that I lessen the authority of the evangelists when such a great man says these things in defence of the authority of the Gospels? And after all this I testify that I am reluctant to attribute any forgetfulness to the apostles, but among the many ways of avoiding this problem I mention this one also, joining my own comments to those of others, with no intention of implying that the evangelists wrote only with human understanding. Where the Holy Spirit guides memory and forgetfulness, there forgetfulness is as useful as memory, if indeed you can call it forgetfulness when as one is speaking something comes into his mind that he recounts later.

OBJECTIONS 49–50. 'And in his commentary on Acts and his *Response to Zúñiga* he said: "The apostles learned their Greek from the speech of the common people."[546] And in the same book, chapter 10, he says "The apostles were men; they did not know certain things and in some things they were wrong,"[547] and Erasmus says these things in the passage in which he treats of the writings and preaching of the apostles.'

RESPONSE 49. I responded to this calumny more than ten times to people like Béda, Zúñiga, Lee, etc, and again in the *Annotations,* which makes me wonder why they should bring them up as if no answer at all had been made. If the apostles learned Syriac by living among the Syrians, why could they not learn Greek living among those who spoke Greek, or even Latin? For a good part of Syria at that time spoke Greek, and since it was under the rule of the Roman Empire we see that many Latin words are mixed in with the Greek by the evangelists.

* * * * *

546 Acts 10:38 *Annotationes ad Novum Testamentum* ASD VI-6 250:669–71; *Apologia contra Stunicam* ASD IX-2 150:773–82. In answer to Stunica's criticism Erasmus says that it is of no importance whether Peter spoke to the Greeks in Caesarea in Hebrew or in Greek for they would have understood him in either language. He interpreted the Pentecostal gift of tongues to mean that the apostles' words would have been immediately understood by people of different languages. In the 1519 edition of the *Novum Testamentum* he wrote a long disquisition on this subject in answer to a letter from Johann Maier von Eck, a distinguished professor at Ingolstadt (Ep 769).

547 ASD VI-6 250:681

RESPONSE 50. Is it not true that the apostles were men? I think so. Was there nothing they did not know? I don't think so. On the contrary, there were many things they did not know. Did they not err in some things? Why therefore is Peter reproached to his face by Paul?[548] How is it that there was a disagreement between Paul and Barnabas?[549] As to their claiming that I speak about the preaching of the apostles, let them deal with Augustine, who defended this; it is never affirmed by me. Indeed, I have a different opinion and I defend merely what pertains to the truth of dogma. Therefore, it is obviously false that I speak here about the writings and the preaching of the apostles. Concerning preaching it is Augustine's opinion, not mine. I speak about their writings in various places but in what manner about their writings? That the apostles wrote badly? I never profess this insanity. Perhaps occasionally they mix in Hebrew forms of speech with the usage of the Greek language, as here they added the pronoun 'him.'[550] Did the apostles err, therefore, in their writings? They erred sometimes, not against the teachings of God, but against the rules of the grammarians. And yet the words my accusers wrote do not speak specifically about this. But what is the meaning of my words? 'That we should not immediately attribute whatever there was in the apostles to a miracle. They were men, they were ignorant of certain things, they made mistakes in some things. We digest food without a miracle; if we do not know the way, we ask; from a distance we think someone is Peter, but it is John. The same things could happen with the apostles without a loss of credibility. This is what my words meant. Then, proceeding to what is more difficult, I add separately 'even after receiving the Holy Spirit, etc,' citing an opinion of Augustine;[551] in other places I indicate that I do not approve of it. They will say: 'If you do not approve of it, why do you cite it?' Because I

* * * * *

548 Gal 2:11–14, where Paul rebukes Peter at Antioch for eating with Gentile Christians

549 Acts 15:36–41

550 ASD VI-6 250:662–3. At the beginning of the annotation to verse 10:38 Erasmus says that certain manuscripts had the reading *ὅν ἔχρισεν αὐτόν* (literally, 'whom he anointed him'), where the personal pronoun at the end is redundant, which he attributes to Semitic influence. The only manuscript that exhibits this reading is Codex Beza, and there it is added as a correction. Yet, according to H.J. de Jonge Erasmus did not know this codex. ASD IX-2 151 n774

551 ASD VI-6 250:682. Erasmus does not cite Augustine specifically here. Perhaps it is a lapse of memory on his part. He did refer to Augustine on this same subject in an annotation to Matt 2:6 (ASD VI-5 100:819–32), where he was discussing the erroneous citation of the prophet Micah by Matthew. He speaks there of the mysterious workings of the Holy Spirit and how the apostles were not free

am arguing with those who do approve of it. Augustine admits error in the apostles in doctrine and preaching, not only in solecisms or barbarisms but in meaning, which I do not accept. In their writings he admits no falsehood, in which he agrees with me. But there are things in these writings which do not agree with the rules of grammar and with the usage of those who spoke correct Greek; this cannot be denied. But the question is whether they learned this command of language in a human way through association with men or from the inspiration of the Spirit. It seems to me that since it is the common language, they learned it from the common speech, perhaps before they had begun preaching. I do not assert this, however, but I close the annotation in this way: 'It is not my intention to fight for this or any other opinion if the church thinks differently.'[552] But there are three matters under discussion: the preaching of the apostles, of which Augustine speaks; the canonical writings of the apostles, which are without error, even if they are not lacking solecisms, barbarisms, hyperbata,[553] incorrect phraseology, and other linguistic shortcomings; and third, the vicissitudes, words, deeds, or writings of the apostles that do not pertain to matters of faith. Yet look how these have been confused with malicious cunning, with all the parts of the mosaic joined together to produce calumny. Whether this is a holy inquisition let others decide. I think a defect of speech is of no more harm to the authority of the apostles than if they preached the Gospel in torn and coarse clothing. But let them read my annotation at this point, especially in the fourth edition.[554] No better response can be given that will set before our eyes the shamelessness of this calumny.

OBJECTION 51. 'And at Romans 8 he impiously criticizes Paul in this way: "But what follows does not fit unless we want to admit that Paul has not completed the construction, whether through forgetfulness or lack of skill or in careless use of the Greek language."'[555]

* * * * *

from error. In that commentary he refers to Augustine's description in various works of Peter's misconduct, as recorded in Gal 2:11–14, even after the reception of the Holy Spirit.

552 ASD VI-6 254:749–50

553 Violations of the natural word order

554 It is in the second edition that the annotation is greatly expanded.

555 Rom 8:3 ASD VI-7 192:837–9 / CWE 56 200. The Latin of the Vulgate in this verse is quite awkward and ambiguous. The literal translation, *impossibile,* of the Greek adjective *ἀδύνατον* could be understood to mean the total 'impotence' or 'helplessness' of the Law, making it weak and ineffectual. Erasmus supplies a

OBJECTION 52. 'And the same is true of what he comments about Titus in 2 Corinthians 2 and in chapter 10 in the margin: 'Paul is not very learned in Greek."'[556]

RESPONSE 51. Since here it is not a question of meaning but only of the grammatical structure of the words, what kind of impiety are they dreaming up? If it is impious to find something lacking in the speech of the apostles, then Jerome is often impious and all the ancient writers. On the contrary, these defects of the language of the apostles contribute to the glory of the Gospel, which is not preached in the persuasive words of human wisdom lest the cross of Christ be made void.

And since I am speaking in a disjunctive manner I am free to choose from the three the one that seems most convenient. And yet I do not affirm this, but I say 'unless we wish to admit.'[557] Would Paul be brought to trial if he neglected the cultivation of the Greek language? But if he neglected the adornments of words for a pious reason, how can one who attributes this to him and praises him on that account be called impious? Therefore Erasmus does not assemble things impiously but they assemble things maliciously. This is a fine way to treat me, calling me away from serious matters with such inanities.

RESPONSE 52. What is this? Are they going to charge me with something that someone added in the margin? And yet this whole case must be fought to the finish with Jerome, who affirms this in so many passages;[558] the Spirit did not take away all ignorance from the apostles, but he imparted as much knowledge to them as was necessary for the work of the Gospel. A great knowledge of Greek would have been more harmful to the Gospel. What is

* * * * *

paraphrase, '*quod lex praestare non poterat*' (what the Law could not accomplish), which is much more comprehensible. It is simply a linguistic matter with no doctrinal repercussions. It is quite ridiculous for the Spaniards to call a grammatical clarification impious.

556 2 Cor 2:13 'but my mind could not rest because I did not find my brother Titus there [in Troas].' Erasmus comments that Paul felt the absence of Titus because he was more learned in Greek. I was not able to confirm this reference to a note in the margin in chapter 10.

557 See objection 51.

558 In the 1535 edition Erasmus paraphrases Jerome *Epistles* 120 11 4–5 CSEL 55 507, in which Jerome says that although Paul spoke various languages he could not express in the Greek language the majesty of the divine meaning, and for this reason Titus served as an interpreter, as Mark was an interpreter for Peter.

my commentary at this point? I relate that certain interpreters have felt that Titus was missed by Paul because he was more learned in Greek.[559] Thomas Aquinas states that this is true and so does Theophylact.[560] I myself do not approve this comment, not even with one little word, but I indicate it was rejected by Thomas.

OBJECTION 53. 'And at Romans 15, where the blessed Paul gives a supernatural explanation for his actions, Erasmus attributes it to some ambition or other. He says: "Paul, out of a kind of holy ambition, stayed away from those places where the other apostles had preached so that he himself might be the father and founder of his own people."[561] And in the margin it is written, "the ambition of Paul."'

RESPONSE 53. In Greek the word for ambition is *φιλοτιμία*, that is, desire for honour, which is often regarded as a vice, but not always; still, the Latin word sounds harsher than the Greek one. For Paul himself in this passage used the word *φιλοτιμούμενος*, and to explain the deeper meaning I add these words: 'The verb *φιλοτιμεῖθαι* means 'to attempt something through ambition.'[562] So Paul from a kind of holy ambition stayed away from those places, etc. When I say 'out of ambition, as it were' do I not state clearly enough that I am using the word loosely? Again, when I say 'a kind of' do I not say that it is a catachresis?[563] And when I add the word 'holy,' do I not immediately exclude a sinful ambition? Is it not holy anger to be angry at vice? Is it not holy avarice never to satisfy one's desire to learn what one should know? Is it not holy revenge to crush the enemy, the devil, with good deeds? Is it not holy pride for a man dedicated to Christ to spurn the honours of the world? Is it not holy ambition to lead a candidate to baptism by one's good works, as we

* * * * *

559 2 Cor 2:13 ASD VI-8 348:369–71. He had elaborated much more fully on the question of the apostles' knowledge of languages in the note to Acts 10:38 ASD VI-4 250–4:662–759.

560 Thomas Aquinas *Super epistolas S. Pauli lectura* 1, *Super 2 Cor* lectio 3 69 453 ad 2 *Cor* 2:13; Theophylact *Expositio in 2 Cor* 2:12–13 PG 124 821C

561 Rom 15:20 ASD VI-7 352:714–16 / CWE 56 409

562 C.E.B. Cranfield gives 'to be eager,' 'to strive eagerly' as translations, adding 'in relation to what he understands to be his own particular function in the service of the gospel, namely that of a pioneer preacher.' *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (Edinburgh 1975) vol 2 763

563 Improper use of a word

read about Martin?[564] Is it not holy cruelty to dash the little ones, that is, evil emotions, against the rock?[565] Are not such figures of catachresis also found praised in the books of orthodox writers? What was the point of their saying 'some ambition or other' when I said 'holy ambition'? O holy inquisitions of such great pillars of the church!

OBJECTION 54. 'And in 1 Corinthians 4 he says: "If Paul cannot explain clearly what he feels, either his own ignorance was to blame, or the language itself is not sufficiently polished, or it is the subject matter itself. But he explains the matter in the Hebrew tongue, in which he was most skilled."[566] From this it clear that Erasmus was convinced that the evangelists wrote the holy Gospels of Christ not under the inspiration of the divine spirit but through their own native ability, and therefore, according to him, as men they were able to make mistakes and sometimes did make mistakes. Let others judge whether this opinion of Erasmus is impious or Catholic.'

RESPONSE 54. Since this annotation of mine cites the words of Jerome I wonder why they do not prefer to deal with him rather than with me.[567] I discuss, but he affirms that Paul was not able to transfer what he felt and what he meant in the Hebrew tongue into a clear form of Greek. He declares the same thing in *Ad Hedibiam, quaestio XI* in these words: 'And although Paul had expert knowledge of the Holy Scriptures and possessed charm of speech in various languages, he was not able to explain the majesty of divine concepts in a fitting fashion in the Greek language. Therefore he had Titus as an interpreter, just as Peter had Mark, etc.'[568] You should have quarrelled with him, not with me!

But the annotation itself answers their objections, although this calumny is too shameless and unlearned to merit any response. Let us come to the conclusion. Let us grant that Paul could not speak a very polished Greek, what then? Did he therefore lack the gift of tongues? On the contrary, he had a gift that sufficed for the preaching of the Gospel. Let us grant that he was more eloquent in Hebrew than in Greek; therefore, when he spoke

* * * * *

564 Luther
565 Ps 136:9
566 1 Cor 4:3 ASD VI-8 82:711–13
567 Jerome *Epistles* 121 10 4–5 CSEL 56 1 42:9–18
568 Jerome *Epistles* 120 11 4–5 CSEL 55 507:13–22. In a longer note in the annotation to 2 Cor 4:6 Erasmus refers to the Cilician colouring of Paul's Greek, invoking once again the authority of Jerome's letter to Algasia. ASD VI-8 447:30–60

Hebrew he had the gift but when he spoke Greek he did not? In the same way Barnabas was lacking because Paul was more eloquent so that he was even thought to be Hermes.[569] It is still not agreed whether after receiving the gift of tongues the apostles spoke in all languages or whether speaking in one language they were understood by men of different languages. And that gift was not always present but only as often and to the extent that the circumstances required a miracle.

If Paul had spoken with stuttering speech, would he not have preached under the inspiration of the Spirit? And if he spoke in a common and unadorned language, which he had learned from the people and in which the Spirit wished him to preach the Gospel, will evangelical preaching be automatically attributed to human powers? Were they able to make mistakes in meaning because they lacked elegance of speech? So Christ also could make errors since he spoke to the crowd in the common language, for that audience correctly, but for those learned in Hebrew uncouthly. But Christ could speak in whatever manner he wished to speak, not so with the apostles. If to speak contrary to the rules of grammarians and rhetors is to make a mistake, it is clear that both the apostles and the evangelists made mistakes. If to make a mistake is to err in meaning, I never said that the apostles erred in their writings. I do not make judgments concerning the rest. On the contrary, I think they never made a mistake in words although Augustine said this of Paul.

OBJECTION 55. 'He either interprets many things in the Sacred Scriptures wrongly and subverts their meaning or completely overturns them, from which we have collected the few that follow as a clear example of Erasmian temerity. In the book *Hyperaspistes* he said that free will cannot be proved from the Sacred Scriptures.'

RESPONSE 55. Since they do not indicate the passage, I suspect that either it is not in my writings or it is said with another meaning and in different words.[570] Otherwise what could be more stupid than that I prove free will

* * * * *

569 Acts 14:12

570 In *Hyperaspistes* 1 Erasmus answers Luther's attacks in *De servo arbitrio* against Erasmus' views expressed at the very beginning of his *A Discussion of Free Will* about the obscurity of the concept of free will, countering Luther's reiterated assertions that the scriptures are clear to those illumined by the spirit. He never says explicitly that it cannot be proved from the Sacred Scriptures but insists that 'there are some secret places into which God did not intend us to penetrate very far.' CWE 76 8. In *Hyperaspistes* 1 he responded only to Luther's attacks on

from the Sacred Scriptures and in the same work profess that free will cannot be proved from them? It is agreed that free will is something but it is not sufficiently agreed what free will is. It is agreed also that this word is not found either in Greek or in Latin in the sacred volumes. Some passages of the Scriptures seem to take it away entirely, others to establish it. From the comparison of these passions we defend free will. But this subject runs over into certain inscrutable recesses concerning predestination, future contingencies, and divine justice, on which the Scripture itself imposes silence on us, saying: 'O man, who are you to argue with God?[571] But it was up to the holy inquisition to indicate the passage, not to make pronouncements on their own, and after delivering their reproof to go off like the bath-attendant after he has doused the client with water. It was the duty of the holy inquisition to present my words and leave judgment to others. As it is, they are prejudicing the judges and doing this with insulting language, these pillars of religion, moderation, and sincerity.

OBJECTION 56. 'And in his book *On the Method of Theology* he said: "Read through the whole New Testament, you will find nowhere a precept that pertains to ceremonies, or about fasting and similar things."[572] He calls abstinence from food a ceremony.[573] And in the colloquy "The Religious Feast" he includes baptism and other sacraments among ceremonies.'[574]

RESPONSE 56. A ceremony can be said in general parlance to mean whatever is done in religious practises with perceptibly prescribed rites, and in this way nothing prevents us from saying that the sacraments of the church are also called ceremonies, for they are visible signs, as when Peter admonishes women not to place confidence in the adornment of their hair or clothing or gold.[575] Likewise, when Paul advises the same thing and in addition orders women to be veiled in church, it cannot be denied that he is ordering

* * * * *

the preface and introduction of *A Discussion*, leaving the scriptural arguments for book 2. He obviously does not wish to enter into this convoluted argument here.

571 Rom 9:20

572 *Ratio* ed Holborn 239:23–5

573 They are probably referring to *De delectu ciborum scholia* 53, where Erasmus classifies abstinence as a ritual. ASD IX-1 87:618–20 / CWE 73 131

574 'Convivium religiosum' ASD I-3 255:727–8 / CWE 39 13–14

575 1 Peter 3:3

something that pertains to a visible thing.[576] And the same can be said for what he prescribes about the Lord's Supper,[577] about singing with the tongue and the spirit[578] and about prophesying to one another.[579] But this passage teaches sufficiently that I am not speaking of these kinds of ceremonies, but of those that pertain to works of piety. For I am speaking there of charity, which renders us truly pious and resides in the soul, not in external things. It is not relevant to respond here about the sacraments, although not even this type of ceremony produces piety if nothing is added to the external signs. What Paul described about the silence of women in church and veiling their head were not precepts that would contribute to piety forever, but that pertained for that time to the propriety and concord of the church.[580] For among the Italians women are not veiled in church in some places and young women are veiled even in the street. And today women sing in church without disturbing the Lord's Supper as was done in the past, and the rites of singing psalms, of interpreting and prophesying to each other, as Paul prescribed, no longer exist, but these things change according to regions and times. It is enough that what was meant by these ceremonies remains. Paul said, 'Lifting up pure hands.'[581] Does one pray badly who prays without washing his hands and without lifting his hands up to heaven? Concerning those things that properly and for all time contribute to piety, many commands are given about praying, helping the poor, about sobriety, modesty, long-suffering, love of God and of one's neighbour. These are my words: 'Read through the New Testament, you will find nowhere a precept that pertains to ceremonies. Where is there any word about food or clothing? Where is there any mention of fasting or similar things?[582] And in what follows I give examples about the Sabbath, the prohibition of eating meat and dairy products, about Jewish discrimination in foods. Moreover, it is sufficiently clear from the tenor of the language what ceremonies I was thinking of, namely, those that bind us with prescribed rites. But those we mentioned above from the writings of Peter and Paul are not of that type. Peter did not prescribe the colour, the form, and the materials of the clothing married women were to wear,

* * * * *

576 1 Cor 11:13
577 1 Cor 10:16–20
578 1 Cor 14–15
579 1 Cor 14:3
580 1 Cor 14:35
581 1 Tim 2:8
582 *Ratio* ed Holborn 239:23–5; 240:1–14

but by mentioning simplicity of dress he recommended it.[583] Nor did Paul prescribe that women should be veiled with a black veil extending to the waist, of coarse material, but only ordered them to be veiled,[584] which at that time even among the pagans well-born women were accustomed to do in the company of men. He did not prescribe a new kind of silence, as today silences are prescribed for monks at certain times and in certain places, but what was recommended for natural public propriety, seeing that not even among the pagans do well-born matrons frequent the public meetings of men, or if they do, they are silent, because nature has subjected that sex to the masculine sex. This was observed more strictly among the pagans than among Christians, among whom Christian charity has relaxed some of the rights of men, as it has eliminated slavery in many places. I was speaking of the kind of ceremonies in which colour, type, and form of clothing are prescribed: a leather or a rope belt, knotted or without knots, three inches wide or narrower, black or white sandals, closed or open; when fasting is prescribed on certain days until the eleventh hour or from that hour until midnight and at the same time the eating of meat or dairy products is forbidden and the threats of hell are added, besides other punishments. The *Methodus* spoke about our ceremonies of this type. The New Testament advises against choice of foods and days rather than ordaining them. We find in the New Testament that fasting was observed by Christians and praised by the apostles, but I do not remember reading that it was prescribed with certain rites. These things are not mentioned so that any ceremonies that the church has instituted concerning clothing, fasting or similar matters should be despised, but to show that Christ and his apostles were more concerned with things pertaining to salvation. Since now too much is attributed to ceremonies of this kind so that we seem to have relapsed into Judaism, what would have happened if Christ or Paul had prescribed such things? Since the Gospel at that time was in danger because of the superstitious ceremonies of the Jews, the apostles refrained from such precepts. Isn't this a marvellous inquisition?

OBJECTIONS 57–58. 'In the *Apology against Lee,* fifth response, he asserts that the prophecy of Isaiah, an important pillar of our faith, "Behold a virgin shall conceive,"[585] on which Catholic theologians depend, was distorted by Matthew the evangelist. And he does not hesitate to say the same thing with

* * * * *

583 1 Peter 3:3
584 1 Cor 11:6
585 Isa 7:14; Matt 1:23

like shamelessness against the prophecy, "Truly he has borne our sorrows,"[586] quoted by the same evangelist, Matthew, in the eighth chapter.'"[587]

RESPONSES 57–58. Here the holy inquisition has inserted, not very holily, the word 'distort,' which is not contained in my text. I merely indicate that the evangelist has modified the words of the prophet somewhat to fit the context, without changing its meaning.[588] That this was also done on other occasions by the evangelists and Paul has frequently been noted not only by Jerome but by other orthodox writers. This was pointed out not in order to undermine the testimony of the prophet but to prevent impious calumny, which Jerome often does in the same spirit. And if it had been said that the evangelist twisted the words of the prophet to his own advantage, omitting certain things that pertain more to history than to prophecy, or if he had changed the tense of the verb from past to future, what crime was there? Is this not permitted to the evangelists? If it is not permitted, why do they do it? If it is permitted, what sin does he commit who points out that it was done, either to make the reader's judgment more certain or to prevent calumny? In the first passage, 'Behold a virgin shall conceive,' the annotation contains neither the word 'distorting' nor 'modifying.'[589] It merely indicates what a

* * * * *

586 Isa 53:4

587 Matt 8:17

588 The inquisitors have themselves twisted Erasmus' words. First of all, he did not speak at all of 'twisting' in reference to Isaiah 7:14, but referring to the second passage, Isaiah 53:4, he says that Matthew deflected it somewhat. The verb *deflectere* is much milder than the verb *detorquere* used in the accusation. In the 1516 edition he says that Matthew introduced the prophecy '*alquanto coactius*' (in a rather forced manner), but in the 1519 edition he changed that to '*nonnihil ad suum deflectens negocium*' (diverting it somewhat to his purpose), probably in response to Lee's criticism. He cites John Chrysostom's *Homilia in Matt* 27:1 PG 57 345, where the verse is interpreted in the same way, that Christ's action of driving out demons and healing the sick was a prefiguration of the passion and the taking away of the sins of humanity. Cf *Apology to Lee* ASD IX-4 92–3:535–65 / CWE 72 92–3.

589 Erasmus does not attempt to discuss the first passage from Isaiah and its citation in Matthew. He had engaged in a long and tedious discussion of this in Response 1, note 2 (not note 5) in his *Apology to Lee* ASD IX-4 84–7 / CWE 72 82–6. It regarded a passage in Jerome *Comm in Matt* 1 PL 26 25C on Matt 1:23 concerning Jerome's use of the present tense, *Virgo habet in utero,* instead of the future, *habebit,* of the Vulgate, which is consonant with the future tense *concipiet* in the words of the prophet. In all editions of the New Testament Erasmus retained the Vulgate's future tense, in disagreement with Jerome, but there is no question

contentious and impious person can cite for disapproval but then indicates how the pious person can respond to him. Whoever wants further information may look for it in the response to the fifth allegation of Lee, for I am getting tired of such malicious allegations.

OBJECTION 59. 'And in his book *On the Method of True Theology* he said: "Without allegories I see many meanings of the Scripture that are either absurd, dangerous, pointless, trifling or unsubstantial."'[590]

RESPONSE 59. Here too they do not deign to indicate the passage, although I see nothing worthy of a response. I give the name allegory to anything that departs from the grammatical or the common and simple sense. We read that God walked in the breeze, therefore corporeally in a place, having feet.[591] We read that he sits in heaven and supports himself with his feet on earth. We read that he looked down from heaven upon the sons of man, therefore he has eyes; and some things escape them unless he directs them. We read that he descended from heaven, we read that he repented, we read that he was moved with anger and fury, and countless other things with which Sacred Scripture is full, which if they are understood according to common sense, are not only absurd and trifling but also impious and blasphemous. What is there worthy of the Holy Spirit in the story of how Leah was placed in bed with Jacob instead of Rachel,[592] how the father-in-law was deceived by the screen of shrubs,[593] how theft was concealed by Rachel through the trick of the menstrual flow;[594] how a night was bought for the price of a mandrake;[595] how Samson the lover was tricked by his mistress Delila;[596] how the Shunamite woman warmed David, who felt the cold in his old age, with her embrace,[597] if you do not use allegory? So I wonder what came into

* * * * *

here of 'twisting.' At the end of the response he suggests that Oecolampadius should be consulted since he had an expert knowledge of Hebrew. Not wishing to enter into this argument again, he counsels his accusers to read his answer to Lee.

590 *Ratio,* ed Holborn 282:5–6
591 Gen 3:8
592 Gen 29:23
593 Gen 30:37–43
594 Gen 31:34–5
595 Gen 30:14–16. Leah hired Jacob to sleep with her, paying him with the mandrakes her son Reuben had found in the field.
596 Judges 16:19–21
597 1 Kings 1:1–4. Her name was Abisag.

their minds since they criticize what had to be said for the reinforcement of the Scriptures, unless perhaps they invent a calumny from my words because I said the meanings of Sacred Scripture, since Sacred Scripture does not have absurd meanings. I used 'Sacred Scripture' for the words of Scripture and 'meanings' for 'concepts,' which men conceive through common sense from what they have heard or read.

OBJECTION 60. 'In the annotation to 1 Corinthians 15 he said, "But in the affairs of this world[598] it is perhaps not proper for one who is truly Christian to swear by property and by money,"[599] and he asserts the same thing very frequently elsewhere.'

RESPONSE 60. It is clear that the Lord openly, categorically, and clearly forbade all oaths,[600] although today those who swear oaths and perjure are to be found everywhere. And yet Paul somewhere seems to swear an oath, according to St Augustine.[601] Therefore the ancient writers made efforts to explain how an oath could be excused among Christians. I quote some of their opinions and sometimes I add my own conjecture, never asserting anything, as these persons falsely and shamelessly say I often do. But I responded more than ten times to this calumny to the likes of Lee, Zúñiga, Béda, and others who had nothing to do but create calumny.[602] This much is beyond dispute, that Christ prescribes there the form of perfect Christianity, and that among perfect Christians, where no one distrusts another or devises plots, an oath is superfluous, especially in these trivial matters which good men consider as negligible rather than as something to be bound by an oath. Christ is not speaking there of the law court. I condemn neither war nor oaths, but wherever there is war there is evil, and wherever there is an oath there is evil, as

* * * * *

598 LB mistakenly reads *huiusmodi* for *huius mundi.*

599 1 Cor 15:31 ASD VI-8 294:496–7. The Spaniards purposely omit the next qualifying phrase: 'But when matters concerning Christ are involved, it is not unlawful to interject an oath.' He added in the 1519 edition: 'Christ did not forbid us unconditionally to swear but he wished us to be of such character that there be no need for oaths and that we should not swear as the common people did.'

600 Matt 5:34

601 Augustine *Epistle* 89 (old numbering, corresponding to 157) 40 CSEL 44 487:13–22. Augustine cites the words '*per vestram gloriam*' in this passage as an oath, but says that phrases like '*per meum adventum*' in Phil 1:26 and similar phrases are not oaths.

602 *Apology against Lee* ASD IX-4 88–90:426–80 / CWE 72 87–9; *Apologia ad Stunicae conclusiones* ASD IX-8 258:84–5; *Supputationes* ASD IX-5 338–42:892–939

the Lord says: 'Anything more than this comes from the evil one.'[603] Yet I do not assert anything, but perhaps I say it, and the annotation makes clear in what sense it was said. The rest they can find in what we have responded to others.

OBJECTION 61. 'In the annotation on Luke, chapter 4 he said: "A strange corruption has crept into the Sacred Books"[604] as he often detracts from the authority of Sacred Scripture, when he says: "Both in the Greek and the Latin manuscripts something has been added, subtracted or erased because of heretics."'

RESPONSE 61. The annotation to Luke 4 deplores the fact that in the sacred manuscripts many passages have been corrupted when a learned reader transcribes something from one place to another, then someone else transfers into the text what had been annotated in the margin or in the space between the lines. We show that this has happened often. Nonetheless, the Christian faith is not at risk in this, although it would have been preferable that nothing at all were added or subtracted in the canonical books, and we do our best to remedy this. But if anyone should argue that nothing at all was corrupted in the sacred manuscripts by orthodox scribes, he would earn nothing but ridicule from learned men since the ancient writers and the facts themselves speak otherwise. But if this is to detract from Sacred Scripture, I share this guilt with most holy and well-reputed men, and scribes must have a miraculous power if they can take authority away from the Scriptures. As to their further claim, for which they give no specific passages, that I frequently say that something has been added or subtracted in Sacred Scripture because of heretics, I have said that again and again but do not assert anything. Nor does

* * * * *

603 Matt 5:37

604 The strange corruption (*mira depravatio)* to which the Spaniards refer is what obviously seems to be a contamination of two passages, which Erasmus notes in his annotation to Luke 4:8 (ASD VI-5 507–8:624–32), the narration of the temptation of Christ in the desert by the devil, to whom Christ says, 'Worship the Lord your God, and serve only him.' The Greek manuscripts add the phrase '*ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ*' (get thee behind me, Satan). Beginning with the 1519 edition Erasmus had explained that this passage must have been transposed from the words of Christ spoken to Peter in Matt 16:23. In the 1527 edition he adds, rather maliciously it would seem, that the Spanish biblical scholars adopted this reading for the Complutensian Polyglot Bible, although there is no trace of these words to be found in the Latin manuscripts.

this pertain to the church, but privately to scribes, whose zeal was like that of those who in the history of St Andrew, where in place of what was written in the ancient manuscripts: 'The true Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father and remaining in the Son' substituted 'proceeding from the Father and the Son.'[605] Likewise in the Creed that is now sung in church they changed what had been previously written by the Greeks, 'who proceeds from the Father' into 'who proceeds from the Father and the Son.'[606] For the Greeks, though true believers, did not profess that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both, as the Roman church later defined. I think the same thing happened in the Creed of Athanasius, which today is sung in the prayers of the hour of Prime, since neither he nor Chrysostom nor Nazianzus nor Theophylact profess that the Spirit proceeds from both.

And in fact I do not doubt that in these matters the church can change certain things, but whether this can be done in the sacred volumes, especially if it changes the meaning or even gives the opposite meaning, that is not mine to decide. But on this matter I have given sufficient answer to Pierre Cousturier,[607] again in the annotation to the first epistle of John, chapter 5,[608] and also in a private apology against a certain person designated by the name of Tyrologus.'[609] There is nothing more stupid than calumnies of this kind.

* * * * *

605 *Acta Andreae* ed Jean-Marc Prieur Corpus Christianorum Series Apocryphorum (CCSA 6) (Turnhout 1989) 615. An abstract of this work was made by Gregory of Tours in his *Liber de miraculis beati Andreae, Monumenta Germaniae historica scriptores rerum Merovingicarum* 1 826–46. Cf James Keith Elliott *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford 1993) 244–83.

606 The phrase '*Filioque*' was first recognized as part of the Nicene Creed at the Third Synod of Toledo in 589, but not at any ecumenical council.

607 *Apologia adversus Petrum Sutorem* LB IX 7 744C, 750C–F, 757F–758D, 782B, 791E–794D

608 1 John 5:7 ASD VI-10 550:382–413

609 By private apology Erasmus means that it was addressed to a private individual, an English friend named Robert Aldridge, to whom he reported that a certain Englishman had heaped abuse on his name from the pulpit in St Paul's churchyard, singling out for attack his translation of John 7:39, '*Nondum enim erat Spiritus Sanctus* ('For there was not as yet the Holy Spirit'), omitting the participle *datus* (given) of the Vulgate since it is not in the Greek text. In the original edition of this letter published together with the Greek text of St John Chrysostom *De Babyla martyre* (Basel, August 1527) it was entitled *Epistola … in tyrologum quendam impudentem calumniatorem*, Ep 1538. In the letter of some twenty pages in the English translation, CWE 18 252–73, the first third is a strong defence of the theology of the Holy Spirit. As he explained in his annotation (ASD VI-6 102:647–8) he is not speaking of the substance of the Holy Spirit, but of the gift and the inspiration of the Spirit by which the apostles were suddenly

OBJECTION 62. 'It is not sufficiently clear to us what Erasmus's purpose is or what he is plotting against the resurrection of the flesh when he says at Matthew 28: "I do not know by what chance it happened that neither Origen nor Chrysostom, while writing commentaries on other sections, published anything on this one chapter, unless perhaps they stopped giving sermons to the people because these things pertain to the resurrection."'[610]

RESPONSE 62. Since I defend the resurrection energetically and in a spirited manner in all my writings, if they still do not understand what Erasmus is plotting, it is no secret to me what those who dare to put this in writing, and with authority, are plotting. They are obviously plotting calumny and doing the business of the belly, which will not rise again. And so I repeat my words from the annotation, which are: 'I do not know by what chance it happened that neither Origen nor Chrysostom, while writing commentaries on other sections, published anything on this one chapter, unless perhaps they stopped giving sermons to the people, because these things pertain to the resurrection.' These are my words. Now listen to the meaning: when I was writing the annotations I regretted that I did not have access to the commentaries of Origen and Chrysostom on that point. Therefore, I wanted to know the reason why this happened and I proposed a conjecture that came to my mind at that time. It is this: they are called homilies, that is, conversations with the people. During Lent the people usually flock to sacred sermons in greater numbers, and perhaps at one time sermons during the Easter season ceased and the alleluia was sung. I conjectured that it was for this reason that the homilies of Origen and Chrysostom were missing. I was doubtful at the time I recorded it, but nothing else came to mind. Afterwards I discovered from Greek volumes that they were books, not homilies that Origen wrote on Matthew so that it is probable that the end is missing for the same reason

* * * * *

changed into different men. Nonetheless, he included the word *datus* in the *Paraphrase on John*, perhaps considering the different audience. In the Stuttgart *Biblia sacra vulgata*, *datus* is omitted but in almost all English versions, Catholic and Protestant, it is retained, except for the Catholic New Jerusalem Bible.

610 Matt 28:19 ASD VI-5 348:961–4. This must surely be the most inane accusation made by the monks. From Erasmus' simple statement that the sermons of Origen and Chrysostom on the resurrection are missing they insinuate that Erasmus wishes to imply that they refrained from lecturing on this last chapter of Matthew because it was not genuine. They also suspect that Erasmus denies the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, which is intimately connected with the physical resurrection of Christ.

that the beginning of the work is missing.[611] Chrysostom indisputably wrote homilies. First I gathered some passages that came to my memory concerning the Holy Trinity; if I should wish to list here those concerning the resurrection, an entire volume would hardly suffice. At this point I would not wish to say anything offensive against the holy inquisition; I shall just say that afterwards at the right moment I shall show that the book from which I suspect they drew this material was written not by the Holy Spirit, but by a sycophantic spirit.

OBJECTION 63. 'Erasmus frequently says that the Epistle to the Hebrews, received by a council under the name of the apostle Paul and referred to by the apostle Peter in the last part of the second epistle, was not written by Paul.'

RESPONSE 63. Concerning the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews I have already written ten times, to people like Lefèvre, Lee, Béda and Cousturier, and likewise in the annotations themselves so that it is useless to add anything.[612] I shall only say that what they call a council was not a general council, but the Council of Carthage,[613] at which Augustine is said to have been present, in which it was decreed that nothing should be recited in church except the canonical scriptures, and would that this were observed today. Then, in order that it would be more clearly agreed upon which volumes this title would comprise, after all the volumes of Scripture were enumerated, the letter written to the Hebrews was also included among the letters handed down under

* * * * *

611 Erasmus felt that he had to refute this very serious charge with further evidence. In the 1535 edition of the *Annotations* he adds that Theophylact in his commentary on Matthew states explicitly that Chrysostom did write a homily on this chapter and it is often quoted in the *Catena aurea* (Thomas Aquinas' compilation of thoughts of the Church fathers on the Gospels). In addition, he reports that Anianus of Celeda testifies in the preface to his partial translation of Chrysostom's homilies on Matthew that the last two of them were missing, PG 58, 975–6.

612 *Apologia ad Fabrum* ASD IX-3 161–8 / CWE 83 79–88; *Apology against Lee* ASD IX-4 264:631–47 / CWE 72 324–5; *Divinationes* LB IX 453A–B / ASD IX-5 49–50:9–19; *Supputatio* LB IX 594D–595F / ASD IX-5 380–2:824–83; *Apologia adversus Petrum Sutorem* LB IX 764B. In the *Annotationes*, in a lengthy note appended to the concluding annotation on Heb 13:34, Erasmus argues strongly against Pauline authorship, but does not deny it altogether. He says that whoever wrote it, it is worth reading by Christians for many reasons. ASD VI-10 378–84: 808–903

613 The third Council of Carthage of 397, according to Denzinger *Enchiridion symbolorum* 186. It was previously considered a synod.

Paul's name. There was no discussion of who the author was but the title that had been commonly accepted was added so that it would be recognized. We have stated that Augustine himself was doubtful about the authorship in the books he published as an old man. We also accepted the letter itself and we do not say anywhere that it does not belong to Paul, as these people pretend, but we show that the ancient writers doubted it and, needless to say, we admit that we also doubt what importance it has for our understanding. As for Peter quoting it in the last chapter of the second epistle, I think that up to the present time no learned man has dreamed this to be true. The subject matter itself tells us that Peter's remarks refer more to the things that Paul writes about the coming of Antichrist and about the resurrection. And concerning the author of the epistle itself that is called Second Peter the ancient writers expressed their doubt, as did Jerome.[614] The authority of the work need not be uncertain if its author is unknown or uncertain. But read the many responses we made to these questions, although they are not at all relevant.

OBJECTION 64. 'He maintains vehemently that we should remove the *Apocalypse* from sacred letters, and that it is not by the apostle John and cannot be compared to the rest of sacred letters.'[615]

RESPONSE 64. 'Maintain' and 'remove' are their words, not mine. My annotation records certain arguments, partly from the ancient writers, partly my own. But the following words of the annotation testify how I try to remove this work from Sacred Scriptures: 'But on the other hand I cannot be persuaded that God would have allowed that the cunning of the devil could delude the Christian people for so many centuries with impunity, etc.'[616] Immortal God! How far this is from arguing that it should be removed. As far as the equal merit of its authority is concerned, I say this: 'This book is not persuasive in the same degree since it consists entirely of allegories.'[617] In a contentious dispute allegories are not effective arguments unless Christ or the apostles have interpreted them. Theologians admit this even today.

* * * * *

614 Jerome *De viris illustribus* PL 23 608A. Jerome thought that the style of 2 Peter was very different from that of 1 Peter, but he accepted it as genuine. The preponderant belief today is that it is pseudonoymous. *Annotationes in 2 Petrum* 3:17, ASD VI-10 518:399–401

615 *Annot. In Apocalypsim* 22:20 ASD VI-10 612–14:349–53. This accusation does not correspond to anything Erasmus says in this discussion.

616 ASD VI-10 616:380–2

617 ASD VI-10 618:396–7

St Ambrose and St Jerome did not detract from the authority of Daniel because they preferred Isaiah to all others. I am ashamed to report this chicanery and I regret answering.

OBJECTION 65. 'And he often says that the Apostles' Creed is not by the apostles, or he calls it into question.'

RESPONSE 65. Nothing forbids calling it the Apostles' Creed because of its antiquity and because of the very fact that it contains apostolic teaching even if it was not handed down by the apostles.[618] I mean by 'handed down' 'handed down in writing.' For no Christian doubts that the apostles taught such things, but its very diversity is proof that it was not handed down in writing. One's faith is not shaken if one doubts the authorship of the Creed since the same teachings are contained in the Gospels. There has been doubt about the author of the gospel according to Mark, but that does not weaken its authority. Doubt exists even today about the author of the book of Job and some other books without danger to the Catholic faith. As to the fact that the articles of the Creed are narrated one by one in a sermon attributed to Augustine, apart from the fact that the subject matter lacks credibility, invented to help the memory of catechumens, those sermons seem not at all to be by Augustine.[619] But the same writer in the first chapter of his book to the catechumens does not call it the Apostles' Creed, but says that it was collected from the divine Scriptures and handed down in writing, as a help to human memory.[620] I do not say this to diminish the authority of the Creed since I recognize there the apostolic spirit and majesty. Let them read

* * * * *

618 Erasmus never explicitly denies apostolic authorship of the creed but acknowledges that it was based on their teachings. In the colloquy *Inquisitio de fide* he dramatizes a dialogue on the articles of the Apostles' Creed without saying anything about its authorship. Later, in 1533, he published the *Explanation of the Apostles' Creed or Catechism*. The speakers are a catechist and a catechumen. It is quite a formal treatise resembling Aquinas' procedures in his catechetical sermon-conferences on the creed.

619 On the Saturday two weeks before Easter Augustine was accustomed to recite the creed and give phrase-by-phrase explanations of its content. Four sermons of this type have come down to us: 212, 213, 214 and a miscellaneous sermon that circulated independently, the *De symbolo ad catechumenos.* See William Harmless *Augustine and the Catechumenate* (Collegeville 2014).

620 Augustine *De symbolo ad catechumenos* PL 40 627

what we answered to the twelfth proposition of Béda both in the *Elenchus* and the *Supputatio*.[621]

OBJECTION 66. 'In Epistle 2, Book 1,[622] to Barbier he said: "At any rate, I would not wish to be so devoted to Jerome or Augustine, hardly even to Paul himself, that I would believe everything he said."'[623]

RESPONSE 66. They do not recognize the hyperbole that we should not believe any mortal in everything. He who finds it difficult to believe Paul in everything still believes. In short, no one is held to believe Paul in everything he said, but not to believe in what he left in writing is wrong. And we are not even compelled to believe all his writings, but only those which the church has approved, for there is no doubt that Paul wrote more things on private matters that are not extant. The words of my epistle are: 'If a Lutheran is one who defends and approves without exception all that he has written or will write, I have never yet met such a man, nor do I think anyone is of such insane mind. At any rate, I would not wish to be devoted to that degree to Jerome or Augustine, hardly even to Paul himself.'[624] O marvellous inquisition!

Against Christianity and the Orthodox Fathers

OBJECTION 67. 'In the *Spongia* he said: "But Hutten claims that we must face death for the truth of the Gospel.[625] I too would not refuse it if the occasion demanded it. But as for Luther and Luther's paradoxes I have as yet no wish to seek a martyr's death. It is not a question of articles of faith, but whether the primacy of the Roman pontiff is from Christ, whether the college of cardinals is an essential member of the church body, whether confession was

* * * * *

621 Béda proposition 12 *Supputatio* LB IX 554C–557C / ASD IX-5 296–304:869–1020; *Elenchus* #12 LB IX 497C / ASD IX-5 162–4:50–8

622 Not known what these numbers refer to

623 Ep 1225 280:353–4. The Spaniards changed Erasmus' last clause, '*ut aliquid dicam ὑπερβολικῶς*' (if you will allow a little exaggeration), into their own fabricated ending 'that I would believe everything he said,' thus accusing him gratuitously of not believing all the words St Paul wrote.

624 Ep 1225:350–4

625 *Spongia* ASD IX-1 190:635 / CWE 78 122. For Hutten's statement cf Eduardus Böcking *Ulrichi Hutteni equitis Germani opera quae reperiri possunt* (Leipzig 1859–61) vol 2 *Cum Erasmo Roterodamo theologo expostulatio* 223:4–6.

instituted by Christ, whether bishops can bind us by their laws under pain of mortal sin, whether free will leads to salvation or faith alone brings salvation, whether any human work can be called good, or whether the Mass can in any way be called a sacrifice. For these things, which are the usual topics of Scholastic debate, I would neither dare to take anyone's life if I were the judge, nor would I wish to risk my own life."'[626]

RESPONSE 67. I call articles of faith those that are certain and unquestionable, expressed in the Creeds that the church recites and chants publicly, concerning which no one is allowed to hesitate and which are properly and customarily called articles of faith. For there are Scholastic articles just as there are heresies. And yet these dull-witted individuals do not understand that these things are said against Luther. He considers as an article of faith that the primacy of the Roman Pontiff is not from Christ, nor is confession. Also, that neither bishops nor popes can bind anyone by their laws, that free will is not capable of the slightest good, that faith alone suffices for salvation, that no work of man is good, that the Mass is not a sacrifice, but an abomination. For these beliefs of Luther I say that I do not wish to risk death. And some of these matters are still being discussed among orthodox believers, so that one who doubts within himself whether the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, as it now exists, is from Christ, is not automatically a heretic; or whether the rank of cardinal that now exists is a necessary part of the church, although it is recorded in Roman documents on what occasion it originated; or whether confession, as it now exists, was instituted by Christ; what is free will and how efficacious it is procuring salvation, and whether in some sense it is true that no work of man is good; and in what way the Mass can be called a sacrifice and in what way it cannot. For these things which Luther proclaims and for which he thinks you should face death a thousand times, I say that I neither wish to face death nor kill anyone until these things are examined in the discussions of men. When they have been thoroughly examined, when everything is agreed upon, then I shall follow what the church has expressly pronounced. In the meantime what Luther considers to be holy articles of faith do not have the same importance for me. Finally, it is one thing to punish one who is in error in order to correct him, it is another thing to kill him. There are some errors that are trivial and negligible, some are more serious and deserve a harsher remedy, but short of capital punishment; there are

* * * * *

626 ASD IX-1 190:635–45 / CWE 78 122

those that are very serious and do deserve capital punishment. For those of medium gravity I say that I would not kill anyone, professing my own belief but not taking away from others the right to do what they wish. And it is not automatically unlawful that I should not wish to do it. If men should be burned at the stake for any articles whatsoever, those who attribute original sin to the Virgin mother should be burned. But this does not happen, and if anyone attempted it, the phalanxes of the Dominicans would prevent him.

OBJECTION 68. 'Likewise, in the book *Against the Enslaved Will* he mentions some articles of faith among questions not pertaining to the Christian belief in these words: "As when we deal with the difficulty of questions that arise from the mystical Scriptures, such as when we inquire what it is that distinguishes Person from Person in the Holy Trinity, a thing or a relation; and whether the Holy Spirit, since he proceeds from each, proceeds from one beginning or two, and numerous other questions."'[627]

RESPONSE 68. Here I am forced to find them lacking in all shame. It is not a question of articles of faith in that passage but of complicated questions, which it is best not to discuss before the people. We have shown earlier that there is still no agreement among the Scholastics on how the Persons are distinguished among themselves, and how although the Spirit proceeds from two Persons, nevertheless, he proceeds from only one beginning. It is best to discuss subtleties of this kind in the schools, but sensibly. It is not a matter there of dogmas of the church that must be believed or not believed, but of difficult questions that arise from the Sacred Scriptures in which Luther wishes that there be no obscurity at all. And so I show that he wrongly accused me of attributing obscurity to the Sacred Scriptures when I had spoken not of the Sacred Scriptures themselves but of difficult questions that arise from them, and I introduce some examples of these questions. This passage is in the first edition, which they did not deign to indicate.[628] Let this serve also as an example of the holy inquisition.

* * * * *

627 The source of this quotation is not Erasmus' *De libero arbitrio*, but *Hyperaspistes* CWE 76 132.

628 Erasmus is referring to a passage at the beginning of the *De libero arbitrio* CWE 76 8–10. The CWE edition is based on the first edition, Erasmus *De libero arbitrio διατριβή sive collatio*, as edited by Johannes von Walter, Quellenschriften zur Geschichte des Protestantismus 8 (Leipzig 1910).

OBJECTION 69. 'Likewise, when we read that the wicked are condemned to the fires of hell after this life, the question is asked whether the souls of the wicked are immediately delivered to their punishment after they are torn from their bodies or are preserved in existence to pay the penalty on the last day.'[629]

OBJECTION 70. 'Also whether that fire is material.'[630]

RESPONSE 69. I do not question how the souls are punished but I point out that it is stated in the Sacred Scriptures that the souls are thrown into hell and are punished there. But from this the question arises whether they are delivered over to punishment immediately or whether they are preserved until the day of the Last Judgment, a question that did not seem so easy to the ancient writers, so that in addition to the Greeks even the Roman Pontiff once thought differently from what is now the received opinion. I do not object to this question; I merely say that it is difficult and that it arose from the Sacred Scriptures, but Luther wishes it to be perfectly clear.

RESPONSE 70. The same answer is given concerning material hell fire, which they have turned into natural fire. And I have answered elsewhere to the calumny about material fire.

OBJECTION 71. 'In the letter to Barbier, Epistle 2, Book 1: "But I am afraid, my dear Barbier, that there are many people who attack with great vituperation unimportant matters in Luther's writings, such as 'Whatever the just man does is sinful.'"[631]

RESPONSE 71. I say unimportant, but by comparison. My language indicates that, if they had quoted all of it. For this follows: 'Though they themselves do not believe that which is the basis of all our faith, namely, that the soul survives the death of the body.'[632] Although it is false that whatever the just man does is sinful, and though I believe it is false, yet it can be true in a certain sense and in comparison to other things it is a trivial error.

* * * * *

629 *Hyperaspistes 1* CWE 76 132
630 Ibidem
631 Ep 1225 280:358–60
632 Ep 1225 280:360–1

OBJECTION 72. 'In the *Paraphrase* to John 4 he says: "Faith alone purifies hearts and makes them fit to be entrusted with the secrets of the heavenly philosophy, which we believe."'[633]

RESPONSE 72. I understand the living faith of which the apostle was aware, and by itself alone it does not exclude good works, which after the reception of grace faith produces through love, but only works which preceded baptism. For the *Paraphrase* states that I speak of those who come to baptism from Judaism or paganism, among whom God makes no distinction, whatever way they lived before, but on equal terms purifies their hearts through the gift of faith. I responded on this subject to Béda's proposition 87 and more than once in other places.[634] In addition, since it is clear that through faith man is made capable of a higher doctrine and richer grace, I wonder why they thought these words had to be added: 'And it makes them fit to be entrusted with the secrets of the heavenly philosophy, which they believe.' Do they deny that this is true? But I think that is what was contained in the book from which they excerpted these things.

OBJECTION 73. 'And to the pious reader in his *Paraphrase of John* he said: "Faith is, as it were, our eye, with which we see and know God, and that is enough for our eternal salvation, and in accord with Holy Scripture."'[635]

RESPONSE 73. I can scarcely keep from laughter, friendly reader, when I read these criticisms, while at the same time being gravely distressed and grieved that Christianity has sunk to the point that those who seem to themselves and are held by many to be pillars of faith and piety are not ashamed to publish nonsense of this sort, and by these trifles and deceptions to create trouble for

* * * * *

633 John 4:20 CWE 46 57. The final phrase, 'which we believe' was added gratuitously by the Spanish monks to make it appear that Erasmus adhered to Luther's doctrine of 'sola fides'. They have also taken the sentence out of context. It is from the story of the Samaritan woman, whom Jesus was gradually instructing in the mystery of the gospel religion and therefore began with faith, without which no one is a fit hearer of the gospel teaching, as Erasmus says in the previous sentence. Jesus asks her to have faith in him.

634 *Supputatio* LB IX 630F–631B / ASD IX-5 252–3; *Elenchus* LB 501A–B / ASD IX-5 174:269–79

635 CWE 46 226. This afterword (CWE 42 226–8) addressed to the pious reader was first added to the *Paraphrase on John* in 1524, in some Basel editions but not in others. It was also included in Froben's 1534 octavo, but not in the Froben 1535 folio.

the leaders of the church. Since in the first edition it happened that there were some pages that were blank, at Froben's request I added a colophon on the praise of Christian charity, which John emphasizes in a marvellous manner. I show that charity also has the effect that we learn easily and with little trouble what should be done, according to the passage: 'The fullness of the law is charity,'[636] and 'On this hang all the law and the prophets,'[637] and what the Lord said in another place: 'This is my commandment,'[638] signifying that this one thing embraced everything. Lest anyone think that I am making this up, these words precede: 'This is, of course, that Christian charity which teaches in brief whatever is taught in all the volumes of the Old Testament, all the books of the philosophers, all human laws, etc.'[639] Then I add these words: 'Faith is, as it were, our eye, with which we see and know God, and that is enough for our eternal salvation, and this in accord with Holy Scripture.'[640] What is impious about these words? That I say that faith is sufficient for eternal salvation? If I had meant that, what was the purpose of the words that immediately precede: 'For since our highest happiness lies in knowledge, trust and purity of life, etc.'[641] He who includes purity of life in the sum of human happiness is in great disagreement with those who preach that faith alone is sufficient for salvation. But the little word '*quod*' that I used instead of '*quantum*' gave them the opportunity of making an error. I say that the pious through faith see and know God, not altogether, but as much as suffices for eternal salvation, and for that knowledge the subtleties of philosophers are not necessary, but it can be drawn from the divine books. O amazing impiety! Will they be ashamed at being caught in such a foul error? I don't think so; but they will blame me for giving them the occasion for making an error because of an ambiguous word. But if they had a particle of Christian sincerity, they would have interpreted what was ambiguous in the best light. Indeed if they had compared what preceded with what followed, the tenor of the discourse itself would have showed that another meaning could not be construed. Who will not admit that this is a holy inquisition? But if perhaps they boast that they are of the number of those who, having strenuously neglected the study of grammarians and rhetoricians, rush into theology, they

* * * * *

636 Rom 13:10
637 Matt 22:40
638 John 15:12
639 *Paraphrase on John* CWE 46 226
640 Ibidem
641 Ibidem

should have recognized this figure of speech from the language of Paul. For he writes to the Romans: 'Hence the eagerness in me and in you, etc.[642] 'In me' stands for 'as much as lies in me.' Again in chapter 12: 'As far as it lies in you, live peaceably with all men.'[643] Here 'what lies in you' stands for 'as far as you can provide it.' It is apparent that '*quod*' in this sense, by synaeresis, means '*quoad.*'[644] But I will be of no help to these collectors. That is what that stupid and deceitful book has, from which they took it, and men of theology have put their faith in a book that has no theological validity.

OBJECTION 74. 'In the annotations to Romans 5 he offers an opportunity to Pelagian heretics, who deny original sin, when he rejects a very clear passage that holy men have used as a very valid argument against heretics.'[645]

OBJECTION 75. 'Likewise, favouring Jovinian, he inveighs against St Jerome and in favour of the Pelagians he criticizes Catholic doctors.'

RESPONSE 74. To give a satisfactory answer to this objection I ask no more than that they read my annotation at that passage.[646] I have never denied original sin, although certain people attribute too much to it and sometimes interfere when there is no need. I do not reject the interpretations of that passage by ancient writers, but I quote various interpretations of orthodox writers,

* * * * *

642 Rom 1:15
643 Rom 12:18
644 Synaeresis is the contraction of two consecutive vowels into one.
645 Rom 5:12. LB has the reading *potentissimam* (most powerful) instead of the correct *patentissimam* (most clear).
646 The passage in question is Rom 5:12. Beginning with the edition of 1519 and continuing through to 1527 Erasmus included a brief notice on his controversial interpretation of the Greek ἐφ' ᾧ, translated in the Vulgate as *in quo* (in whom), referring to Adam, *omnes peccaverunt* (all have sinned). He says: 'I do not think it unreasonable to take ἐφ' ᾧ in the sense of 'inasmuch as' or 'since,' so that the meaning is that through one man sin came into the world, but death was the companion of sin and consequently death came to all inasmuch as all have sinned' (ASD VI-7 138 app crit). In his own translation he substitutes the adverb *quatenus*, which means exactly 'inasmuch as.' This interpretation is still very widely supported today. Cf C.E.B. Cranfield *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (Edinburgh 1977) I 277–81. The 1535 edition, in which he attempts to answer the charge of Pelagianism, is greatly enlarged. Much of it is dedicated to refuting the criticisms of Frans Titelmans in his *Collationes quinque super epistolam ad Romanos.*

among whom are Ambrose, Chrysostom, and Jerome himself, if we are to believe titles, and I call one interpretation more weak without condemning the other.[647] But the word 'reject' is nowhere to be found in my annotation. It was added by them for the sake of calumny, and let them judge whether this is fitting for a holy inquisition. Augustine alone, as far as I know, in epistle 98,[648] alleges that this passage of Paul cannot be taken in any other sense, for he was fighting against the Pelagians, who denied that there was any original sin. But those who were at war with the Manichaeans give more approval to the opinion that is more satisfactory to me since I am fighting with those who attribute too much to that sin. And yet this interpretation does not favour the Pelagians more than the other favours the Manichaeans and Genethliacs.[649] But if this is a very clear passage against the Pelagians, with what passage did those who understood it in a different way defend themselves? The passage in the Psalms is stronger: 'Behold I was conceived in iniquity and in sin my mother conceived me.'[650] And this passage from Job is even stronger: 'Not for one day is an infant free from sin.'[651]

RESPONSE 75. I do not inveigh against St Jerome but with very moderate words I show that the ancient writers allowed themselves liberty in disputing with heretics in order to win back in whatever way possible those who did not yet let themselves be taught, by adapting some things to win their

* * * * *

647 Ambrosiaster *Commentarius in Romanos* 5:12. 1–2 CSEL 81, 1, 162–4; Chrysostom *Homilia in Romanos* 10.1 PG 60 473–5; Pseudo-Jerome *Commentarius in Romanos* 5:12 PL 30 668B–D. As Erasmus infers, saying 'if we believe titles,' he was already aware that these commentaries attributed to Jerome were pseudonymous when he published the Froben edition of Jerome in 1516. In the *Annotationes* Jerome is not mentioned until the 1527 edition, where Erasmus states more clearly what he means: 'I had less confidence in this opinion before I discovered it had been proposed by the man whose scholia we have on all the Pauline Epistles, a learned man, as his text reveals, though an impostor had added a preface, pretending the author was Jerome – to make the work more saleable.' ASD VI-7 139 app crit / CWE 56 152

648 Augustine *Epistles* 98 PL 33 363–4

649 They calculated men's fate by devising horoscopes to know what position the stars were in at the time of their birth. Augustine mentions them in *De civitate Dei* 22 28 and *De doctrina Christiana* 2 21.

650 Ps 51:5

651 Possibly a paraphrase of Job 14:4 in the Septuagint according to the very convincing conjecture of P.F. Hovingh in ASD VI-7 161n340. In his refutation of Titelmans Erasmus argues that Pelagianism is effectively refuted by this passage.

case. Jerome himself admits this in places, and if he were to deny it, it could easily be shown through very clear examples, not only in this case but in others as well. He does not give this advice on behalf of the Pelagians, but to strengthen Christian doctrine, which is made stronger the more solid are the arguments used by theologians and the more sincerely they treat Scripture. And the philosophical arguments of the schools of theology have this purpose. It is not a criticism of the Catholic doctors to show what should not have been done or what could have been done better. Therefore, the words 'inveigh' and 'criticize' in defence of the Pelagians and Jovinian are words of calumny, not of a holy inquisition. The passage in the annotation reads as follows: 'Unless perhaps we allow ourselves to twist the words of Scripture in any way at all to gain the victory in disputing with an adversary, who must be vanquished rather than taught. This is what Jerome seems to do sometimes in his struggle against Jovinian, and so does Augustine on occasion. I have said these things, I repeat, not to favour those who deny the existence of original sin but because I do not wish, as far as possible, that any violence be done against Scripture.'[652] These words are not redolent of invective against orthodox writers, or favour towards heretics, but zeal for true doctrine.

Against the Honour of the Blessed Virgin Mary

OBJECTIONS 76–77. 'In the book on *Praying to God* he maintains that the perpetual virginity of Blessed Mary cannot be taught by the clear testimony of the Sacred Scriptures, and he explains it with improper words,[653] and with this same meaning he weakens somewhat the passage in Isaiah: "Behold a virgin, etc," in the *Annotation* to Matthew 2.'[654]

RESPONSE 76. Why should I not admit what Jerome admits?[655] And yet I give this as an example of those passages handed down by the general consent of the fathers and the church, which we are obliged to believe no less than if

* * * * *

652 CWE 56 165 / ASD VI-7 164:388–93

653 CWE 70 187 / ASD V-1 146–7:886–9

654 Actually, Matt 1:23 ASD VI-5 88–90:544–76. This is a long, inconclusive discourse on the Hebrew and Greek words for 'young girl' and 'virgin.'

655 Namely, that not everything can be proved by Scripture. In his polemic against Helvidius, who believed that Mary had normal marital relations with Joseph and had other children by him, Jerome wrote a fierce tirade, *De Mariae virginitate perpetua adversus Helvidium* PL 23 194–216, but it is based more on grammar and a rather strained logic rather than on Scripture, as he himself admits.

they had been expressed in the Sacred Scriptures.[656] No orthodox writer ever contradicted the perpetual virginity of Mary. I am not unaware that some adduce the passage, 'I know not man,'[657] which seems to have the meaning of a life-long intention. But the result does not always correspond to the intention, and there I am speaking of clear testimonies, not conjectures. My words, which they call improper, are these: 'For the sake of argument let us concede what these persons claim, that nothing that is not expressed in the canonical books can be required by human ordinances. They overlook this principle, however, in the case of the perpetual virginity of Mary, the mother of Jesus. Although this is not a teaching based on clear scriptural testimony, it has been handed down to us by the consensus of early orthodox writers.[658] No one, therefore, would think that we should tolerate anyone who claimed that Mary had intercourse with her husband after the birth of Christ, or perhaps not even anyone who had doubts about this. But if they respond that no one should be tolerated who disputes or doubts Mary's virginity because they are trying to eradicate a probable belief, long approved by an overwhelming consensus of people throughout the world, something that cannot be done without disturbing public tranquillity and without giving grievous offence to the Christian flock, etc?'[659] I ask again and again, 'What is improper in this discussion?[660] I do not know if they are offended because dogma is lacking in the case of the Virgin, and perhaps they imagine that I am talking about a dogma of the church when I argue about the belief of those who say that the saints should not be invoked. And it may be that they are offended by the little word 'perhaps,' as if I doubt whether a person who has doubts about the perpetual virginity of the Virgin should be tolerated. But in their wisdom they should have known that the adverb 'perhaps' refers to those whom I am fighting against. It is they about whom I have doubts whether they will

* * * * *

656 McConica n491 above

657 Luke 1:35

658 Erasmus turns the argument against his accusers, in a sense, by saying that many of them believed in the perpetual virginity of Mary although it had no basis in Scripture. This was true of Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, and other reformers. He then proceeds to name early orthodox writers who accepted this tradition: Jerome *De Mariae virginitate perpetua adversus Helvidium* PL 23 183–206; Ambrose *De institutione Virginis et Sanctae Mariae virginitate perpetua* PL 16 321–48; Hilary *Commentarius in Matthaeum* PL 9 921–2; Augustine *Sermones* 190 PL 38 1008.

659 *On Praying to God* CWE 70 187 / ASD V-1 146:884–94

660 Erasmus is being a bit evasive here. He avoids discussing his use of the expression *'a viro cognitam'* (ASD V-1 147:489–90), a biblical euphemism referring to marital intercourse.

tolerate one who hesitates, for they state openly that they will not tolerate one who asserts his disbelief. The words that follow prove that this is true: 'If they responded etc.' How annoying it is to deal with people who, being unversed in the Latin language, understand nothing unless it is arranged in conclusions, corollaries, and irrelevant matters.

RESPONSE 77. I showed above that this is altogether false since I confirm there the testimony of the prophet, indicating how the possible objections of adversaries may be refuted.

OBJECTION 78. 'In the annotation to Luke, chapter 1 in explanation of the phrase, "She was troubled," he said it was because she heard an affectionate greeting that suggested something proper to a suitor, and he twists the angelic greeting to have this meaning, especially the words, "full of grace."[661] He criticizes St Bernard and other theologians not without some injustice who gave a pious interpretation of this as praise for the blessed Virgin.'

RESPONSE 78. I have amply responded to Lee's calumny and in addition in the annotation itself, stating that what I say is also pious and was handed down by holy men, unless perhaps the word *procus* (suitor) and the verb *amandi* (loving) sound indecent.[662] Concerning 'full of grace' I describe the matter as it is, lest anyone should err. As for how unjust I am towards Bernard and others, who interpret this piously in honour of the Virgin, these words make it clear: 'I see that some theologians and men, learned and pious in other ways, of whom Bernard is one, made surprising speculations about the words 'full of grace,' as if they were particularly applicable to Mary, etc.'[663] What I say is

* * * * *

661 Luke 1:28 ASD VI-5 458–9:368–97

662 CWE 72 131–7. Erasmus roused criticism in many quarters by his annotation on the angelic salutation. By changing the Latin translation of the Greek *κεχαριτωμένη* from *gratia plena* of the Vulgate to *gratiosa* (graceful or lovely), he destroyed the dogmatic implication of the word as referring to 'divine' grace. In the first three editions of the *Annotationes ad Novum Testamentum* at the annotation to Luke 1:28 Erasmus had used the improper language cited by the inquisitors, but in the fourth edition of 1527, responding to the criticism of Edward Lee, he changed the text radically to '*salutationem novam ac praeter solitum blandam* (a new and unusually polite greeting). I think that in this case the inquisitors had good reason to object.

663 ASD VI-5 458:386–8. He refers to St Bernard *De laudibus virginis matris, Homilia 3* PL 183 72A–73B.

too clear to be denied. Luke did not say '*gratia plena*,'[664] and other saints were said to be '*gratia pleni*.' I wished to point out this error, even if it were a pious one, and it was preceded by a duly respectful preface. If this is not lawful, then I frequently stumble over this stone in the *Annotations*.[665]

OBJECTION 79. 'Likewise in that same chapter in explaining the phrase "opening up the womb,"[666] citing Ambrose and Origen, whom other learned men piously explain, he makes them clash with piety in these words: "It conflicts with that pious credulity implanted long ago in everyone's mind that Christ issued from the closed womb of the Virgin without any defilement, without the exertion and travail of a woman in labour."[667] And in the margin there is a gloss on how Christ opened the womb of his mother.'

RESPONSE 79. Here they seem to be joking. First, is not the anthem, 'In his birth Christ issued from the closed womb of the Virgin,' which the church chants and believes, an expression of piety?[668] And does not what Origen seems to me to mean, with which Ambrose does not disagree, clash with this opinion?[669] I do not say it conflicts with piety but with pious credulity, for Scripture nowhere teaches that he issued from the closed womb of the Virgin. Pious credulity sometimes believes things that are not so because they have the appearance of piety. Nor do we read anywhere that Mary brought forth without travail, without the usual haemorrhage, without pain, and that the child issued forth as the sun penetrates glass, which remains undamaged; but pious credulity favours such beliefs because they are likely to win approval. But I am inclined to think that they are offended by the verb 'clash,' as if the contest were being carried on with catapults and swords. But in Latin *pugnare* often signifies 'to dissent.' To make answer for the marginal annotations, what is there worthy of reproach? Do I not show there how both views may be expressed piously? And that Christ was born from a closed womb in such a way that he would not violate the enclosure of chastity when he is-

* * * * *

664 Ie Luke wrote *κεχαριτωμένη*, which did not have the connotation of divine grace.
665 *Adagia* I v 8
666 Not the same chapter, but Luke 2:7
667 *Annotatio in Lucam* 2:23 ASD VI-5 482:16–18
668 Not identified, not even through a correspondence with the monks of Solesme
669 Origen *Hom in Lucam* PG 13, 1836C–37A; Ambrose *Expositio in Lucam* CCSL 14 56, derived from Origen. Erasmus explains that the offending phrase, *adaperiens vulvam,* is not directly used of Mary but refers to a Mosaic law. It translates a Hebrew idiom meaning 'to be born.'

sued from it, as he did not violate it when he entered, and that he opened the womb of the Virgin because he was truly and bodily born of her.[670] Curses on that stupid book, from which men excerpted such nonsense!

OBJECTION 80. 'And in the same place and at Matthew 12 (12:47) he speaks most irreverently of the same Blessed Virgin, making her equal in her feelings to an ordinary woman and doubtful in her faith at the time of the passion, bringing forward authorities who are piously interpreted by Catholic scholars.'[671]

RESPONSE 80. The word '*irreverentissime*' ('most irreverently') is the word of a calumniator, and I do not attribute to her what they invent. I cite there the words of Chrysostom and Augustine, which seem to attribute a certain amount of human feeling to the Virgin Mary, and even so I interpret this in a way in which it can be understood without harming the Virgin's dignity. Next, I do not understand very well what they mean by Catholics, except perhaps that they do not consider Chrysostom, Augustine, and Paulinus as orthodox,[672] and yet I give the same interpretation as those whom my accusers approve. Read the annotation and you will find that this is so. I only slightly find fault with those who perhaps with pious but exaggerated zeal attribute to the Blessed Virgin more than she herself would wish to acknowledge. It is not enough for them to prefer her to all the saints without also making her equal to the Son, not to say preferring her to the Son. And I am afraid that those who do this are not so much inspired by love of the Blessed Virgin as they are anxious to flatter women, which is a source of good hunting.

* * * * *

670 This sentence was added in the edition of 1522. Perhaps this is the 'marginal gloss' referred to in the accusation.

671 Matt 12:47 ASD VI-5 218–20:625–9. In this passage Christ's mother and his brethren are seeking to speak to him while he is still addressing the crowds. Erasmus here cites the comments of Chrysostom in the translation of Trapezuntius, in which the action of Christ's mother and his brethren was accounted as somewhat inopportune and that they should either have entered in with the crowd to hear him or at least waited until he had finished. Erasmus in 1519 speaks of the possibility of what is called actual sin but adds that affection is free of all fault. In 1522 he eliminates that judgment, saying unequivocally that doubt and maternal affection are free of fault. Once again the Spaniards omit important elements of the annotation.

672 Chrysostom *Homilia in Matthaeum* 44 (45) 1 PG 57 465; Paulinus of Nola *Carmina* 6 108

OBJECTION 81. 'Likewise in the colloquy "Courtship" the suitor says to the girl: "But if, as I hope, our marriage will not be barren, we'll give back many virgins for one." Maria then responds: "But they say chastity is a thing most pleasing to God." And the suitor: "And therefore I want to marry a chaste girl, to live chastely with her. It will be more a marriage of minds than of bodies. We'll reproduce for the state; we'll reproduce for Christ. How little difference there will be between this marriage and virginity! And perhaps some day we'll live together as Joseph and Mary did."'[673]

RESPONSE 81. Although once again whatever is said in the *Colloquies* under whatever name or in whatever way is attributed to me, I don't see what can offend anyone here except perhaps that it is an insult to Mary, mother of Jesus, that I introduce there a young girl named Mary wooed by a suitor. What could be more stupid than that? But then what is so stupid that they do not treat it seriously? Perhaps they are offended by what the suitor says: 'How little difference there will be between this marriage and virginity, etc.' It's amazing how much evil there is in that little word '*quantulum*' (how little). And yet, this is said by a young lover to a girl he loves. Here I ask you whether suitors usually talk this way with girls? If a chaste boy marries a chaste girl; if he lives chastely with her, that is, not for the sake of lust but of offspring, and after the offspring is born they refrain from carnal relations; if the offspring is brought into being for the Christian republic and for Christ, that is, is educated in a religious manner, and this is the goal of marriage, there will not be much difference, I think, between such a marriage and virginity of whatever kind. So speaks the loving suitor, not Erasmus. But there was still one more scruple over the word 'chastely' because offspring are not brought into being without sexual intercourse. First of all, it is not absurd to call a woman chaste who preserves marital fidelity to her husband; temperate and legitimate intercourse does not make her unchaste. If this were not so, nevertheless the young man responds that it may come about that even in marriage they will progress so much in their desire for chastity that they will abstain from all sexual intercourse, as Mary lived with her spouse Joseph, never separating herself from him and obeying him as her husband. Who ever heard a more pious conversation, especially in a colloquy between a suitor and a young girl, in this little composition devised to teach boys to speak Latin? How great a threat it would be to the Catholic faith if the conversation of all suitors and young girls were like this? And, of course, they

* * * * *

673 CWE 39 265

criticize it out of their love for virginity and celibacy, as if the world does not know what kind of celibacy and virginity they practice, which I wish to be said without insulting those who are truly chaste and virgins. For there is nothing more honourable than true and spontaneous chastity.

OBJECTIONS 82–83. 'Likewise in the colloquy "Shipwreck" Adolph says: "There you would have seen what a wretched plight we were in – the sailors singing *Salve Regina*,[674] calling her Star of the Sea, Queen of Heaven, Mistress of the World, Port of Salvation, and flattering her with many other titles which the Sacred Scriptures nowhere assign to her."[675] Antony: "What does she have to do with the sea? She never went on a sea voyage, I believe." Adolph: "Formerly Venus was protectress of sailors because she was thought to have been born from the sea. Since she has ceased taking care of them, the Virgin Mother has taken the place of this mother, who was not a virgin."'[676]

RESPONSE 82. This irony, though said in jest, is not aimed at the most Blessed Virgin but at men's superstition, who though they lead unchaste lives nevertheless in danger prefer to have recourse to the Virgin rather than to God, as to one who is more easily moved by entreaty, and they flatter her with human titles that are not found in the Sacred Scriptures. For there she is called Mother of Jesus, not Queen of Heaven or Mistress of the World or Star of the Sea. It is not these titles that I criticize but the superstition of those who think they can mollify her with such titles, who do not sense what sincere piety is whenever a truly pious attitude is commended.[677]

* * * * *

674 An antiphon to the Blessed Virgin Mary, existing in a beautiful plainsong melody, dating to the end of the eleventh century from manuscript evidence. One chronicle traces its origins to the pilgrim shrine of Puy-en-Vélay. It is sung after the office of Compline.

675 Epithets of the Blessed Virgin contained in the litany of Loreto. It may have had its origins through Dominican influence in the confraternities of the Rosary and later took its name from the shrine of Loreto on the Adriatic coast of Italy, where it was said that Mary's house was transported by angels from Ephesus, where she died. Erasmus wrote a '*Liturgia matris apud Lauretum cultae liturgia*,' ASD V-1 95–109, which was published in November 1523.

676 CWE 39 355

677 Erasmus had to answer to the Parisian theologians for this episode. He defends himself in the same way, saying that it was all in jest and it was not aimed at the Virgin but at the sailors. *Declarationes ad censuras Lutetiae vulgatas* CWE 82 299

RESPONSE 83. There is no irony directed at the Virgin here but at the superstition of those who implore the aid of the Virgin in the same spirit as the pagans implored Venus, as if Christ brings help on land and his mother at sea. If the world is not full of this superstition, I shall admit that I said these things without good reason, although they are said both in jest and in the person of someone else.

OBJECTION 84. 'And he used similar irony against the Blessed Mother of God in these words: "Since there was nothing else left, one man grabbed a wooden statue of the Virgin Mother, now rotten and mouse-eaten, and putting his arms around it, began to swim."'[678]

RESPONSE 84. This article does not deserve a response unless perhaps he should have taken a stone statue to help him swim. And although human stories are told here, which are commonly recounted for one's own gratification, they examine them as if I were describing articles of faith. Let them rather examine Poggio's *Facetiae* and the dialogues of Pontano if they have so much leisure.[679]

OBJECTION 85. 'And in the colloquy "The Spectre" he makes use of the same irony against the honour of the Blessed Virgin in these words: "First the most effective exorcisms were collected and some new ones were added: "By the bowels of the Blessed Mary and by the bones of St Winifred."'[680]

RESPONSE 85. This article is also not worthy of any response. A spectre is depicted there conceived by art, an idiotic exorcist, who to his solemn words of exorcism added some new ones: 'By the bowels of the Blessed Virgin and by the bones of Saint Winifred.' The church does not have these formulas. What has this to do with the Blessed Virgin? But if they are so religiously devoted to the honour of the Virgin, let them know that every offence against the Son is most displeasing to the Virgin Mother; let them know that whenever they

* * * * *

678 CWE 39 358

679 The *Facetiae* of Poggio Bracciolini (1380–1459), written in Latin, is a collection of scurrilous and humorous anecdotes concerning personages of his time or figures from classical antiquity and the Middle Ages. The five dialogues of Giovanni Pontano (1429–1503) are more satiric in tone, dealing with subjects like popular superstition and the corruption of the clergy.

680 CWE 39 536. St Winifred was a legendary Welsh saint (died c 650) whose abbey at Holywell was a famous place of pilgrimage.

treat virgins dedicated to God differently than befits chaste women, this is an offence against the Virgin. Whenever they sow discord between wife and husband, not to mention anything else, the Blessed Virgin is greatly offended, since she wishes every marriage to be tranquil and inviolate, that is, like her own. Here they should show their devoted religious scrupulousness, which they now exhibit in matters of no consequence.

OBJECTION 86. 'Likewise, at the end of his book *On Praying to God* you, pious judge, may judge for yourself how he attempts to eradicate pious devotion to the Virgin Mary from the minds of the faithful.'[681]

RESPONSE 86. The Virgin is best worshipped by imitation. There is nothing there that detracts from the worship of the Virgin, but it shows the human feeling of certain persons, which is excused, not attacked. The passage is on page g 2, seeing that they do not deign to indicate the passage. If those who everywhere display the worship of Christ eradicate the worship of the Virgin, I profess that I am of that number. The sacred anchor of our salvation is fixed in Christ, not in the Virgin.

Against the Authority of the Supreme Pontiff and of the Council.

OBJECTION 87. 'In many places he seems to feel that the primacy of the pope is something new, and that it was not conferred on him by Christ. And in the *Spongia*, folio 6, he contends that the authority of the supreme pontiff is not an article of faith nor is it one of those things for which a man can be sentenced to death by a judge.'[682]

OBJECTIONS 88–89. 'In the annotation to Matthew, chapter 14,[683] and in the colloquy "An Examination Concerning the Faith" the phrase "I believe the

* * * * *

681 CWE 70 224–5 / ASD V-1 172:791–800. Erasmus expresses his preference for praying to Christ rather than to the Virgin. For example, he says that 'Blessed be the womb of the Virgin Mary' is not an appropriate prayer before meals. He also remarks that instead of imploring the help of the Virgin at the beginning of sermons, calling upon her as 'the fount of all grace,' it would be better to call upon the Spirit of Christ.

682 CWE 78 122 / ASD IX-1 190:638

683 Not chapter 14 but Matt 16:18, ASD VI-5 248:392–5, where Erasmus says that he is astonished that there are some who twist the passage, '*Tu es Petrus*' to refer to the Pope in Rome.

holy church," which we cited above among the things he says against the Eucharist.[684] "Whether bishops can make one liable to mortal sin by their ordinances is not an article of faith, nor would I be willing to die for such things nor kill others, if I were the judge" in the *Spongia*, folio 6.'[685]

RESPONSES 87–89. To these three articles I think I have made adequate answer and do not wish to burden the reader so often with the repetition of the same things. I shall say only this: concerning the primacy of the pontiff, which some now attribute to him, who teach that no evil and impious pope can be deposed or censured but only mildly reproved by the highest princes; who teach that if the universal church were to decree something and only the pope, let us say Alexander VI,[686] should approve something different, everyone will go to hell as schismatics and heretics, but only Alexander will take flight to heaven; who teach that in order to make a decision, no matter how grave, there is no need of a pontifical council, either general or provincial, or even a council of cardinals, if he wishes to use absolute power: whether

* * * * *

684 The objection to using 'in' before 'the holy church' in the Apostle's Creed was that the use of the preposition before '*Ecclesiam*' and other articles in the Creed having to do with creatures and mysteries would give them the same authority as those concerned with the Deity. Erasmus comments on the explanation given by Rufinus of Aquileia, *Expositio in Symbolum apostolorum* 36 PL 21 373, in his own *Explanatio Symboli*, published in 1533, CWE 70 256 / ASD V-1 221:463. Here he cites Augustine, who does not add 'in.' *De fide et symbolo* 10 21 PL 40 193. In the catechism of the Council of Trent 'in' is omitted, but in the Latin version used in the Tridentine liturgy it is retained. See the extensive commentary on this passage in the colloquy 'An Examination Concerning the Faith,' CWE 39 442n97.

685 CWE 78 122 / ASD IX-1 190:640. Erasmus used the term *crimen capitale* for 'mortal sin' here, which is rather strange, more redolent of the judicial term 'capital offence.' The Spaniards obviously took it from the longer form of his response to the theologians of Louvain in 1522, whereas in the shorter form of that document he used the usual theological term, '*peccata mortalia.*' He says in the longer form: 'Yet no one says in my work … that episcopal constitutions do not render us liable to the charge of sin unless there is an element of contumacy as well. Indeed the speaker in my work concedes that a bishop is able to institute this requirement.' Ep 1301 132–3:106–10

686 Alexander VI, Rodrigo Borja (his name is usually Italianized as Borgia), pope from 1492 to 1503, was known for his dissolute life. As cardinal he fathered many children, including the infamous Cesare Borgia and Lucrezia Borgia, by his numerous mistresses. He is remembered as one of the most licentious and corrupt popes in the history of the papacy.

this primacy, I say, was instituted by Christ I have strong doubts. The theologians of Paris say that his power is not superior to a universal council. But these men gladly exaggerate the power of the pope, not because they are so well-disposed towards him, but because their own grandeur depends on his prerogatives. I said that I do not wish to die for such an article or kill anyone. They conclude that such a person should not be killed. But just because I do not wish to do something does not automatically make it bad. Perhaps I am more clement by nature than others.

OBJECTION 90. 'He often pleads the case of Luther and Lutherans against Catholics, sometimes secretly, sometime openly, which will be no mystery to one who reads his works, especially the letters and the catalogue of his works.'

RESPONSE 90. Since nothing specific is presented here and since I have already answered such calumnies so many times, I think it is superfluous to waste my time again in refuting them. I merely find them lacking in seriousness since after such protracted clamouring, malicious attacks, and insulting language, after the matter was referred to eminent judges, they bring forward what they wish out of their own heads instead of verified opinion, which they should have stated verbatim.

Against the Emperor and Other Christian Princes.

OBJECTION 91. '"That which is written in the Gospel and the apostolic letters on tribute, taxes, on the honour owed to kings, on obeying officials, all of this pertains to pagan princes. The Christian owes his fellow Christian nothing but mutual charity" in his book *On the Christian Prince* and in the *Annotations* on the Epistle to the Romans 13.'[687]

* * * * *

687 ASD IV-1 166:979 / CWE 27 260 The citation from *On the Christian Prince* is much abbreviated and paraphrased, vitiating what Erasmus said, which is perfectly acceptable. The relevant parts of the passage read as follows: 'Do not let it escape you that what is said in the Gospels or in the apostolic writings about the need to endure masters, obey officials, do honour to the king, and pay taxes is to be taken as referring to pagan princes, since at that time there were not as yet any Christian princes. The instruction is for non-Christian authorities to be obeyed lest any disturbance of the civil order should occur, provided only that they keep within their jurisdiction and do not give orders that offend God …

RESPONSE 91. I know, dear reader, that you have long been asleep, worn out by such frivolities, but I ask you to wake up for a while since we have come to the emperor and Christian princes, whom they are trying to provoke against me. But they would not do this with such a ridiculous fabrication if they considered that the Emperor and Christian princes are men. In the epistle to the Romans chapter 13 I annotate how the ancient writers interpreted these words of Paul: 'Owe no one anything except to love one another.'[688] To their opinion, which I do not disapprove, I add my own, which is this: 'When Paul was writing this, all external magistracy was in the power of pagans, or certainly not in the power of Christians. Therefore in this situation Paul orders that whatever is required by their law be paid to pagan princes and magistrates, even if at times they exact more than what is owed to them: "Taxes to whom they are due, revenue to whom revenue is due, respect to whom respect is due, honour to whom honour is due."[689] This refers to pagan magistrates; what follows can refer to Christians, among whom at the time no magistrate was popular: 'Owe no one anything except to love one another.'[690] After you have paid the pagan magistrate what he demands you cease to owe him anything; but a Christian always owes mutual good will, which does not need exaction, but he spontaneously offers what his neighbour stands in need of.[691] Thus far the annotation. What is there in that interpretation, related to that time, that is opposed to the Emperor? On the contrary, it is in his favour. For if Paul wishes us to pay the pagans and idolatrous princes whatever they demand for a public, that is, non-religious function, how much more does he wish that the same tribute be paid to Christian princes, whose armour and laws serve not only public tranquillity but also the Christian religion? Now when I cite Ambrose as the author of

* * * * *

But what does he go on to say about Christians? "You ought not," he says, "to have debts among yourselves, except to love one another."' (Rom: 13: 8) ASD VI-7 312:964–83 / CWE 56 352–3

688 Rom 13:8. In his commentary he cites passages from Origen, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Ambrose [ie Ambrosiaster], and Augustine: Origen *Comm in Rom* 9 30 PG 14 1231A; Chrysostom *Homilia in Rom* 23 3 PG 60 618; Theophylact *Expositio in Rom* 13 8 PG 124 517B–C; Ambrosiaster *Comm in Rom* 13 8 CSEL 81 1 442–3; Augustine *De doctrina Christiana* 4 20 CCSL 32 147. Cf. ASD VI-7 312:964–9 / CWE 56 352–3

689 Rom 13:7

690 Rom 13:8

691 This sentence is not part of the annotation, but merely a further elaboration by Erasmus. It is mistakenly put in italics in LB.

this opinion, why do they argue with me rather than with him?[692] Why they add these words about obeying the courts I cannot imagine since the annotation contains nothing of the kind. The *Paraphrase* explains my opinion more clearly.[693] Why do they not bring that into the discussion? If I should wish to rehearse here in how many passages I teach that Christians should obey even bad princes, I would reveal the incredible shamelessness of this criticism, but I would burden the reader with the tedium of reading.

What, therefore, is the subject of the book *On the Christian Prince*? Is it to teach people that they should not pay taxes to a Christian prince? Who was ever so bereft of reason? How would princes fulfil their function if the people paid them nothing? But I show the difference between a pagan tyrant who extorts as much as he can from the unwilling, rightly or wrongly, not only what is lawful, while the Christian prince, who so rules that his subjects willingly pay what they owe, and does not exact more than he is owed. Christ paid the two drachmas for himself and Peter[694] when he did not have to, for he adds that he pays it in order not to scandalize them. To obey the commands of pagan princes in that way was to tolerate them as far as one could while preserving one's piety. But the Christian prince is the father of his country and mutual charity must remind the people and the prince of their duty. And a little later I avoid calumny, saying: 'I hope that at this point in the discussion the following thought does not creep into someone's mind: "What then? Do you take away the prince's own rights and attribute more to the pagan than to the Christian?" On the contrary, I stand up for the rights of the Christian prince, etc,[695] in which I pursue the matter further. And after this I add a chapter on taxes and exactions, which I teach must exist, but that they should be moderate.[696] If this recommendation displeases them, let them remember that if it becomes customary that leaders exact taxes from monks also, they should give what is asked amply and without murmuring, reflecting within themselves that if according to Paul these were owed to pagan princes, how much more to Christian princes? And if in order to regain public tranquillity the people indulge the wishes of bad princes, who exact even what is not owed to them, how much more readily should we who

* * * * *

692 Ambrosiaster *Commentarius in Romanos* 13: 8 CSEL 81 1 420
693 *Paraphrase on Romans* CWE 42 75–6
694 Matt 17:27
695 CWE 26 235–6 / ASD IV-1 166:979–81
696 CWE 27 260–2 / ASD IV-1 188–92

profess the highest contempt for the things that princes require of us do the same? Let them think this over, I say, if my recommendation displeases them.

Against Church Ceremonies

OBJECTION 92. 'In all of his works he makes many proposals by implication, speaks and teaches wrongly about the ceremonies of the church, which he openly admits doing in the catalogue of his works.'

RESPONSE 92. I have responded so many times that I do not condemn ceremonies that the church has instituted, but that I greatly approve those that are serious and not excessive. I frequently criticize those who in their reliance on ceremonies neglect those things that are more relevant. Since it is principally concerned with the integrity of the Christian religion I do not regret having done so, nor shall I cease to do so when necessary. For there is a type of ceremony which men fashion for themselves, each according to his own preferences, and it is amazing how much certain persons attribute to these ceremonies. I nowhere testify that I do what they claim, but I shall never cease testifying that I do not do these things.[697] A fine accusation!

Against the Choice of Food and the Fasts of the Church.

OBJECTION 93. 'He writes many things against the choice of foods and church fasts, especially in the book *On the Choice of Foods*, which he openly admits that he did in the catalogue of his works,[698] and in the book *On the Prohibition of Eating Meat* he said: "The apostolic letters condemn those who prohibit certain foods, especially where Paul says: 'Prohibiting foods which God created for us to eat and prohibiting marriage.'"'[699]

* * * * *

697 On the contrary, he often speaks out vociferously against ceremonies, emphasizing an interior piety, especially in the *Enchiridion.*

698 In the *Catalogus novus omnium lucubrationum Erasmi Roterodami* Erasmus merely mentions that in the category of *apologiae* he wrote a letter to Christoph von Utenheim on the eating of meat. He explains that he had not written with a view to publication, but was forced to publish it when he found that it was in circulation and feared that it would surely be published by someone else. Ep 1341A:346

699 1 Tim 4:3 in *Epistola de interdicto esu carnium* ASD IX-1 44:748–50 / CWE 73 94

RESPONSE 93. In that same book many things are said in praise of Christian fasting as also of chastity.[700] I merely discuss there whether it is expedient, considering present customs, not to eliminate fasting, but the obligations of fasting, thinking that as a result we would have more who are truly fasting than we now have fasting haphazardly, and those who do not fast would be less guilty of sin, and those on whom fasts are not imposed would be less afflicted in spirit. I propose this only for bishops to examine, condemning and execrating in the meantime those who either neglect or ridicule the constitutions or customs received from the church. Therefore their objection is obviously groundless.

Paul expresses his contempt regarding choice of foods in several passages and Peter in the Council of Jerusalem eliminated abstinence altogether,[701] and before them the Lord himself taught that man is not defiled by what enters into his mouth.[702] Since these things are manifestly true, they cannot be denied. I do not condemn the constitutions of the fathers that originated in feelings of piety if the present manner of life demands a change of some constitutions, which we see was often done by the church, and in matters of greater importance than the prescription of abstinence and fasting.

Abstinence, which Paul condemns, is to be condemned today also among Christians, for whoever abstains from meat, as if the food renders a man unclean, or eats fish as if fish bring cleanliness, performs a Jewish and superstitious action. And for that reason the apostles did not prescribe anything in this matter; rather they taught indifference, lest the weak be drawn by the occasion into Judaism. But if today the same danger is upon us, perhaps it would be expedient to abstain from these prescriptions, but in such a way that what was removed from ceremonies would increase piety. Nevertheless, I leave all jurisdiction in this matter to the bishops. We answered Béda on this subject.[703]

* * * * *

700 Erasmus must be referring to the second-named book, where he speaks at greater length about fasting, chastity, and priestly celibacy. ASD IX-1 20–6, 28–32 / CWE 73 65–73, 75–80

701 Acts 15:20. At the Council of Jerusalem Peter instructed the apostles and elders that they should abstain only from things polluted by idols, from fornication, from whatever had been strangled, and from blood.

702 Matt 15:11

703 *Divinationes ad notata Bedae* LB IX 486C–488A / ASD IX-5 134:808–14

Against Celibacy

OBJECTION 94. 'He prefers matrimony to celibacy in the *Encomium of Matrimony* and in the colloquy "Courtship."'

RESPONSE 94. First of all, in a declamation the purpose is not the truth of the subject under discussion but native talent and skill in speaking. In the first part of the declamation the declaimer must present all his reasons, just as the theologian must present all his arguments that will be used against his opponent. In addition, marriage is not there preferred to celibacy absolutely but it is shown to be more useful to the one with whom the case is being argued. There is no doubt that to some people marriage is more useful than the profession of celibacy. Moreover, celibacy in that piece does not signify a chaste and virginal life, but a life free of matrimony, even it is unchaste. Finally, if rhetorical exercises and fictitious themes are invoked in questions of faith, let them also examine the declamation *In Praise of Drunkenness*,[704] and similar ludicrous examples. And yet in my declamation virginity is attributed to angels, marriage to men. I should be surprised if the suitor persuades the girl he loves to marry him. Celibates abound everywhere in the world, but there is an enormous scarcity of those who live chastely. But we have already responded on this subject to Jan Briart and recently also to Josse Clichtove.[705]

Against the Scholastic Doctors

OBJECTION 95. 'Beside the fact that he indirectly condemns Scholastic philosophy in many places, in the *Enchiridion* he said: "Christ forbade his disciples

* * * * *

704 Christoph Hegendorff (1500–40), a great admirer of Erasmus, published a parody entitled *De laude ebrietatis* in 1526. Ulrich von Hutten is also said to have written an *Ebrietatis laus* around the same time.

705 Jan Briart, vice-chancellor of the University of Louvain, attacked Erasmus' *Encomium matrimonii* without naming the work or the author, in a graduation ceremony. Erasmus replied with a short *Apologia pro declamatione de laude matrimonii,* also without any mention of names. Josse Clichtove, a prominent Flemish theologian, attacked Erasmus' views on marriage and celibacy, singling out the *Encomium matrimonii.* Erasmus wrote a short defence in answer and published it as an appendix to a refutation against Noël Béda. A few years later, after the Paris faculty of theology published its censures against him, he wrote a longer defence of his writings on marriage, *Dilutio eorum quae Iodocus Clithoveus scripsit adversus Declamationem Des. Erasmi Roterodami suasoriam matrimonii* ed Emile V. Telle (Geneva 1968). English translation in CWE 83 110–51

to allow themselves to be called master or lords; thus it is ignorant and ambitious for masters to allow themselves commonly to be given this name.'"[706]

RESPONSE 95. I frequently say things against sophistic theology and useless questions because it is something worthy of rebuke. I never condemn Scholastic theology but frequently approve of it. Let my books be my witnesses. But what can shame those men? It is undeniably true that Christ forbade this,[707] and those who love to be called Rabbis are deservedly criticized even today, and what kind of Rabbis, sad to say! who glory and are puffed up with this title more proudly than the scribes and Pharisees of old! What haughty looks, what a chin, what jowls, what affectation we see in some of them![708] so that you can see the exalted Rabbi from afar off. What does this have to do with pious and honest Scholastic doctors? But they themselves would do well if they did not attribute this not only ambitious but foolish title to others and forbid it to be given to themselves.

Against Indulgences

OBJECTION 96. 'One can readily discover how much importance Erasmus gives to indulgences by reading his works. In the *Enchiridion* he says this: Bishops want Christians to believe that their indulgences have such power that you would think they had been given to them by Paul, Andrew, and James.'[709]

RESPONSE 96. No one doubts that a bishop can remit something of the punishments inflicted by ecclesiastical censure if it seems that this is expedient for the salvation either of his flock or of him on whom satisfaction has been imposed. But as to how much indulgences are worth in hell I think even the Roman Pontiff is in doubt. And yet these pardons have never been absolutely condemned by me, but I have rather given warning to those who trust in them superstitiously. In the administration of the sacraments the power of

* * * * *

706 CWE 66 101; Holborn 107: 10–13; ASD V-8 244:325–6. See also *Praise of Folly* CWE 27 130, where he ridicules this title.

707 Matt 23:8

708 In his annotation on 1 Tim 1:6 (ASD VI-10 10–30) Erasmus delivers a long tirade against the convoluted, impenetrable language of the theologians, glossing the word *vaniloquium* of the Vulgate, *ματαιολογία* in Greek. Similarly, in the *Ratio* ed Holborn 297–301, and in the *Folly* CWE 27 126–30.

709 Not found in the *Enchiridion*

the bishops is equal to that of the apostles, but we are not bound to attribute the same importance to the words of the bishops as we give to the writings of the apostles, concerning which it is not permitted to have doubts. But they do not indicate passages, and I have no time to investigate. In any event I have no doubt that the passage itself would be sufficient proof to exclude calumny.

OBJECTION 97. 'He says many things in the *Colloquies* against veneration of the saints, sacred relics, statues and pilgrimages to holy places, which because of their great length we pass over.'

RESPONSE 97. I often speak in my writings, but in keeping with the dignity of the subject, against the superstition with which some worship the saints in an improper manner and venerate their relics, adore their statues, and undertake long and useless pilgrimages in their honour, and in the meantime do not strive to imitate the lives of the saints, but rather are more sinful under the cover of religion. He who teaches true worship of the saints speaks both for men and for the saints, even if by so doing he takes away from someone else's profits.

Against the Right to Temporal Goods

OBJECTION 98. 'In the *Enchiridion*, sixth rule, he says: "Christian charity knows no private ownership."[710] And in the same place, "Did you think ownership was forbidden only to monks and poverty imposed on them alone? You are wrong. Both rules were for all Christians."'[711]

RESPONSE 98. Paul wrote to all Christians that those who buy should act as though they had no possessions, and those who deal with the world as though they had no dealings with it.[712] If Aristotle wishes that all things be in common among citizens as far as use is concerned,[713] much more fitting is it among Christians that charity bring it about that all things be in common,

* * * * *

710 CWE 66 93; Holborn 99:18: ASD V-8 236:113
711 CWE 66 98; Holborn 104:17–19; ASD V-8 242:241–3
712 1 Cor 7:30
713 Aristotle *Politics* 2.5 1263a. He says that private possessions may be put to common use, and at the service of one's friends, but that people should not hold things in common, as Socrates advocates in the *Republic.*

not because it is permitted to anyone to claim for himself what belongs to another, but because he who does not assist his brother who is in need when he is able to do so appropriates to himself what belongs to another. Such a person is not punished by human law, but by divine law. How often pious orthodox writers teach that a Christian is the dispenser rather than the owner of his possessions and that all things are in common by divine law, specifically Augustine in many places, but especially in Epistle 48.[714]

My intent is that men should be more generous in sharing with their neighbour, not in usurping what belongs to others. My words are: 'If you are rich, remember that you are the administrator, not the owner, and be careful how you manage property held in common.'[715] And a little further on: 'The law punishes you if you take something that belongs to another, but it does not punish you if you withhold what is yours from a brother in need. Christ will punish both offences.'[716] With these words I clearly distinguish between divine and human law. And a little before this I say something similar: 'He should regard all his goods as common to all. Christian charity knows no ownership.'[717] It is not said that there is no ownership nor is it said to use another's goods when necessary even when the owner is unwilling, but whenever a brother is in need, when you have something left over, the charity of the possessor considers that it belongs to the one who is in need. Who ever heard of a more impious doctrine?

Against the Freedom of the Will

OBJECTION 99. '"It is not an article of faith whether free will leads to salvation, and I would not want to take anyone's life for this, if I were the judge, nor would I wish to risk my life for it." So he says in the *Spongia*.[718] In the book *On Free Will* he says: "And so, as far as my own position is concerned, I admit that many and various views on free will have been handed down by the ancient writers, and that as yet I have no settled opinion regarding them beyond the belief that I think that a certain power of free will does exist."'[719]

* * * * *

714 Not Epistle 48, but 157 23–40 PL 33 686–93
715 *Enchiridion* CWE 66 98; Holborn 104:15–17; ASD V-8 242:241–3
716 *Enchiridion* CWE 66 98; Holborn 104:19-20; ASD V-8 242:243–4
717 CWE 66 93; Holborn 99:17–18; ASD V-8 236:113
718 CWE 78 122 / ASD IX-1 190:640–1
719 CWE 76 7–8

RESPONSE 99. I have already answered to the first. To the second I shall respond in a few words. Some people have thought that it is in our power to will the good, but not to do it; others say we can neither will nor do good. Again others have written that we have the ability to will the good, although imperfectly, so that we need the grace of God. Certain persons take this away from man also, teaching that man's good intentions are not aided but given by God. Again some call free will the ability to will but that we do not have the power to will the good. This liberty exists also in evil spirits. Others say we are free to will good or evil. The Scholastic philosophers teach that through morally good works a man can merit grace through congruous merit. Likewise there are various opinions on perpetual and new grace. Since there is no agreement among orthodox writers, I may suspend a definite declaration until I hear the voice of the church. I call articles of faith not any opinions whatsoever of the Scholastics but those on which either the Scriptures or officially accepted creeds or universal synods make a clear pronouncement.

Against the Pains of Hell

OBJECTION 100. '"The flames in which the rich banqueter mentioned in the Gospel is punished and the other torments of hell of which poets have written at great length are nothing other than the unending mental anguish that accompanies the habit of sinning." In the *Enchiridion*, rule 20.'[720]

RESPONSE 100. I answered this article fully in the appendix that I added to the *Supputationes calumniarum Bedae.*'[721] And I think that these people have gone far enough now that from the Most High Trinity they have arrived at the depths of hell. Although they claim that their reading is still incomplete, they would employ their leisure time more suitably if they would peruse Ambrose, Augustine, and Jerome, in whom they will either learn something about true Christianity, or if they still feel like calumniating, will find more things liable to such calumnies than in my writings. But if they were sincerely concerned with promoting the church's tranquillity in these troubled times, they would prefer to collect from my writings things that oppose the

* * * * *

720 CWE 66 113; Holborn 120:7–10; ASD V-8 268:683–5. In the *Moria* Folly makes fun of theologians who pretend to know all the details of hell. ASD IV-3 158:504–6 / CWE 27 130

721 *Ex Enchiridio militis Christiani notata quaedam* LB IX 699A–700E

beliefs of Luther rather than those that can be twisted to contain suspicions of Lutheran opinion. In what esteem, most illustrious prelate, they hold your Highness I shall leave it to them to say who burden you with such unnecessary and frivolous detractions. For they have deemed that these things should not only be offered, but dedicated to you. As for me, I should be immensely ashamed to dedicate this *Apology* to such an eminent prelate, but I offer it to you for your judgment, not without a sense of shame and not without sorrow, since as I am ashamed to assault the ears of a man of high rank occupied in affairs of the highest importance with this type of nonsense, so it grieves me in tumults of this kind to divert your high office and my industry from more fruitful occupations to these matters, which are as useless as they are unpleasant. But if you will be able to put up with the tedium of this reading, I am quite certain that you will consider Erasmus more worthy of mercy than of anger. I would rather do anything else but this. At the same time, I shall await your judgment with enthusiastic and good spirit, not because I think there is nothing in my writings that cannot rightly be reprehended, but because I am of the mind that if anything is found that is contrary to authentic teaching, I shall be almost more pleased by the correction of error than by the vindication of innocence.

ERASMUS OF ROTTERDAM TO THE FAIR-MINDED READER[722]

Who would have expected such stupid, dull-witted, ignorant, and malicious views from men who see themselves as pillars of the church? And the ringleaders in this business are first and foremost the Dominicans – not rank and file members, but doctors of theology; secondly there are the Franciscans – and not ordinary Franciscans, but members of that seraphic community known as the Observants.[723] Earlier during the Lutheran troubles they were asleep, but now (mysteriously) they have found the confidence to rush into the forefront of the battle. I imagine the pope threatened to rescind all the privileges he had showered on them if they did not show their mettle. Often, however, their actions simply detract from the influence and good name of the seraphic order without greatly assisting the cause of the church. So relying on this, they stoutly condemn the tiny company of the intelligent and the learned. They are wise to fight with the tongue rather than the pen, for once something is committed to writing, it is difficult to disown it, although often enough they do this too. But when something is said, whether in public or before an audience of hundreds, and someone challenges them, they have a ready answer: 'I did not say it,' 'I did not say those things.' If it comes down to the testimony of witnesses, many are sympathetic towards them, many cannot remember, and those who think they remember generally provide different versions of what they heard. Finally, anyone who quarrels with a friar has to deal with the whole order. So no one is willing to get mixed up in such controversies. They are privy to many people's secrets, they have their spies[724] in the halls of princes and in the households of the wealthy, they have various secret stratagems for taking revenge on those who are unsympathetic to the order. As a result prudent men hold them in dread rather than affection, believing the best course is to have nothing at all to do with people

* * * * *

722 The translation of this letter, Ep 2094, is by Alexander Dalzell, and the notes, slightly modified to be adapted to this apologia, are by James Estes.

723 For the distinction between the Observants and the Conventuals see n11 above.

724 Literally 'Corycaeans.' 'Corycaean' became synonymous with 'spy' because the people who lived near Mount Corycus in Pamphylia were said to be adept at discovering through eavesdropping what cargo was on ships in port, information they then communicated to pirates with whom they were in league. *Adagia* I ii 44: *Corycaeus auscultavit,* 'A Corycaean was listening.' See Cicero *Ad Atticum* 10.18.1.

of that sort. If you allow them a toe in the door, they insert the whole body;[725] if you are uncooperative or offend them, they have remarkably ingenious ways of taking their revenge.

Need I mention here the fuss they caused, first in the emperor's court and then at Salamanca, whenever they asserted openly and publicly that Erasmus was a heretic and worse than Luther? When the leading men realized that their reckless behaviour could not be restrained,[726] they ordered them, if they had anything worth investigating, to lay it before the duly appointed judges and not disturb Spain with seditious clamour of this sort. They were allowed ample time for this. Seven religious orders were involved,[727] from which were selected all the best scholars. In the meantime they had the assistance of a volume of exceptional scurrility whose author had laboured for all of seven years to select from my total corpus whatever could be twisted into a slanderous attack.[728] Without this, when would these fellows (I was tempted to call them 'potbellies')[729] have found the time to turn the pages of so many volumes? When they had collected an immense pile of articles,

* * * * *

725 The Latin proverb is 'Do not show a fool your finger in case he swallows your hand'; *Adagia* III v 5.

726 Erasmus' word for 'leading men' is *principes*, which in this context cannot be read simply as 'princes.' The court of Charles V was, to be sure, interested in the controversies over Erasmus' influence in Spain, and in Ep 1909:44–5 Erasmus says that the disturbances at the emperor's court and at Salamanca were 'calmed though not suppressed by the emperor and a few of the archbishops.' But it was Alonso Manrique de Lara, archbishop of Seville, inquisitor-general of Spain, and dedicatee of the apologia, who took responsibility for the orderly investigation of the charges against Erasmus. In this he had the active support of Alonso de Fonseca. Archbishop of Toledo and primate of Spain.

727 The same number is given in Epp 1893:38, 1909:55–6, 1977:31–3. In Ep 1879:37–45, Erasmus had enumerated six: Trinitarians, Dominicans, Franciscans, Carmelites, Augustinians, and Benedictines, but in Ep 1958:18 he somewhat tentatively added the Carthusians.

728 The reference is to Erasmus' old antagonist Edward Lee, who since 1525 had been Henry VIII's ambassador at the court of Charles V in Spain. Erasmus was convinced that Lee was behind the Spanish attacks on his orthodoxy and that he had composed and circulated a 'scurrilous attack' on him. No such work was ever published and no manuscript has been discovered. Although it is true that Lee was doing his best to sow opposition to Erasmus in Spain, it is unlikely that he had as much influence on Erasmus' Spanish critics as Erasmus believed.

729 On Erasmus' tendency to refer to monks, particularly members of the mendicant orders, as 'potbellies' (*ventres*) ie those who serve the cause of 'their own bellies,' see Ep 1980 n1.

still in an undigested form and with much repetition, they were required by the inquisitor-general to put this mass of material in order and condense it, so as to allow the case to be tried. This was done, and an impressive volume was made public. They had been advised by the inquisitor to avoid abuse and carry out their work in a spirit of Christian moderation, but despite this warning, every heading contains an outrageous insult. They added an abusive preface; in fact, no part of the book is free from insults – unless you think it is not an insult to say: 'He pokes fun at the Blessed Virgin,' 'He condemns the veneration of the saints,' 'His view of the Trinity is heretical,' and much else – this pious brief is crammed with such things. It was presented to a judge, yet throughout it was an attempt to prejudice him and prejudge the issue. Could even the most hostile critic have exposed the ignorance and malice of these men more effectively than they do themselves? And because of the brilliant articles it contained, first the emperor and then the archbishops were pestered with an appeal.[730] Leading theologians from three universities were summoned,[731] a synod was called, and a Mass of the Holy Spirit was said. Alonso, archbishop of Seville, a man distinguished by family, learning, and purity of character, presided over the case. He opened proceedings with the grave injunction that they should constantly hold themselves in check so as to avoid brawling and intemperate language. My defenders in their opening statements were most moderate in their praise of me. But immediately there was a great uproar from the monks, which even the authority of the archbishop could not calm, for they had decided that this was the way to win, knowing that their case was much the weaker. An outbreak of the plague caused the meeting to be adjourned. But the conduct of the monks had been so bad that the archbishop was happy not to reconvene the synod. They boasted that they had collected a longer list of errors, but were told, 'You can know a lion by its claws.'[732] Now, I think, they have received a copy of the polemic that Béda spewed out against me some time ago.[733] Nothing has appeared for two hundred years to match it for stupidity, malice, and ignorance – in a word, nothing more typical of Béda's talents.

* * * * *

730 The archbishops were Alonso de Fonseca of Toledo and Alonso Manrique de Lara of Seville.

731 Two of the three were Alcalá and Salamanca (Ep 1814:276–8). The third was probably Toledo (Ep 2157:607–8).

732 *Adagia* I ix 34; the sense is that one can judge the whole from a single instance.

733 The *Annotationes* of 1526 against Erasmus and Lefèvre (Ep 1721 introduction).

After this they complain that I am unfair to monks. I challenge any of them, whether Dominican or Franciscan, or members of any other order or observance, to produce a single person to whom I have shown myself less friendly simply because he was a monk, unless it is generally held that anyone who will not quietly accept this kind of abuse is an enemy. Good opinions must be earned by good behaviour, not extorted by insults. If Dominic or Francis were alive, it is to them, and no one else, that I would appeal, since the monks take pride in these men as their founders. But alas, how great is the decline from the moral standards they set! This remark is aimed at a good number of the monks, but not at all. Let us pray that the Lord will bring a modicum of sense to these bloated dullards. Reader, farewell.

This page intentionally left blank

THE ANSWER OF DESIDERIUS ERASMUS TO THE PAMPHLET OF A CERTAIN FEVER-RIDDEN INDIVIDUAL

Desiderii Erasmi responsio
Adversus febricitantis cuiusdam libellum

INTRODUCTION

Luis de Carvajal (c 1500–52) was the only son of an illustrious noble family in Orosio, who joined the Franciscan Observants at the age of sixteen. He studied at Salamanca and then at the Sorbonne, thanks to the patronage of Don Lorenzo Suárez de Figueroa, to whom Carvajal would later dedicate his defence of monasticism and the religious life. He was probably aware, to some extent, of what had been debated at Valladolid although he was in Paris at the time of writing. The *Apologia monasticae religionis diluens nugas Erasmi* (Defence of the Monastic Life in Refutation of Erasmus' Nonsense), first published in Salamanca in 1528, is a passionate vindication of his own order, which was so often the object of Erasmus' scornful ridicule. Unlike Zúñiga and other enemies of Erasmus, who attacked specific works, he defends orthodoxy itself.

He begins his attack with an adage of Erasmus, *Cretizare cum Cretensi* ('to play the Cretan with a Cretan'), which he turns into *Erasmicare cum Erasmo* ('to play Erasmus with Erasmus'), to return like for like, as it were.[1] Erasmus is not without his faults, he says, a former monk now scurrilously defaming his confreres. In his decrepit old age he has even turned to writing childish colloquies, filled with pernicious innuendos. When he was a monk under the Augustine rule he accepted the monastic life, modeled on the life of Christ, but now that he has thrown off the cowl [a false accusation] it is no longer pious (3r). This sally initiates a long invective against Erasmus' controversial phrase in the *Enchiridion*, *monachatus non est pietas,* and his condemnation of external ceremonies (6v–7r). This led logically to Luther's permutation of the phrase into *monachatus est impietas*,[2] but in Carvajal's eyes Luther is less dangerous than Erasmus. Quoting the Psalmist, 'You will tread on the lion and the adder,'[3] he comments that Luther vents his anger openly while Erasmus plots in secret (13v). Parenthetically, he insinuates that perhaps Luther was right in calling him an atheist.

In opposition to Erasmus' exaltation of *bonae literae,* especially rhetoric, poetry, and sacred and profane history, Carvajal sets logic, physics, metaphysics, ethics, canon law, and Scholastic philosophy. As far as his knowledge

* * * * *

1 *Apologia monasticae religionis* 5r. References to this work are from the Paris edition of 1529. Further notations will be inserted in the text. '*Cretizare cum Cretensi' Adagia* I ii 29

2 Luther *De fundamentis devotariorum* WA 8 573 #95

3 Ps 90:13

of Latin and Greek is concerned, Poliziano and Nebrija surpass him, not to speak of Pico della Mirandola, master of Hebrew, Chaldaean, and Arabic (8v). Besides, he says, Erasmus sometimes uses words hammered out on a Batavian anvil. Carvajal also alludes scornfully to Erasmus' Dutch origins with invidious comparisons to the sincere and strong faith of the Spaniards. He ridicules his personal emblem, '*Concedo nulli, Terminus*' ('I yield to no man, Terminus'), engraved on his seal, which depicts the god of boundaries, which Carvajal interprets maliciously as a symbol of arrogance and defiance.[4] His caustic comment is that Erasmus yields to no man only in the art of vilification (10v).

He ardently defends the life of poverty prescribed by the rule of St Francis against Erasmus' frequent taunts that the shameless begging of monks is prejudicial to the needs of the really poor, to which he aptly responds with a sentiment of St Paul: If we have sown spiritual good among you, is it too much if we reap material benefit?'[5] He elaborates further: 'What harm do we do if someone gives us a crust of bread, another a slice of lard, another a crock of wine? God will reward them a hundredfold'(15r). 'Erasmus does not understand the canonical hours of prayer,' he continues, and as for his description of the chants of the monks as the braying of asses, he wonders that the earth does not open up and swallow such a blasphemer. From this he passes to a refutation of Erasmus' gibe about monks, that they are gross potbellies born for the plough rather than for study. In defence of the mendicant orders he enumerates a long list of learned Dominicans and Franciscans, past and present (19v–21r). Towards the end of his diatribe he severely criticizes an anonymous book that had recently appeared in Spanish, *Epistola de un celoso de Erasmo* (Epistle of a zealous follower of Erasmus).[6] The author praised Erasmus to the skies and dared to say that if the same method of investigation were applied to Jerome as to Erasmus, he would be called a

* * * * *

4 In a letter to Alfonso Valdés, Latin secretary of Charles v, dated 1 August 1528, Erasmus defended his use of the Terminus seal, explaining that the figure of the god symbolized that 'Death is the true bourne that yields to no one.' Ep 2018:72–3

5 1 Cor 9:11

6 In a letter written in July of 1529 (Ep 2198) Alfonso de Valdés informed Erasmus that it was produced by a bishop, as much a friend of his as he was devoted to Erasmus, but he does not reveal the name. Bataillon conjectures that the author was Diego de Cabrero, bishop of Huesca, who was an ardent defender of Erasmus at Valladolid. Marcel Bataillon *Érasme et l'Espagne* ed Daniel Devoto (Geneva 1991) 351n3

heretic as well. This prompted Carvajal to exclaim indignantly, 'All that is lacking is to place Erasmus on the same pedestal as St Paul!' (29v). Several times in the apologia Carvajal exhorts Erasmus to recant if he wishes to find mercy before the tribunal of Christ. His closing words evince an extreme fanaticism: 'I am one who admires Erasmus' gifts so much that I would not hesitate to shed my own blood if Erasmus would consent to recant those things in his writings that obscure the glory of God' (29v).

Erasmus became aware of Carvajal's book only after the appearance of the second edition, published in Paris in the early part of 1529, and he immediately published his reply with Froben in time for the Frankfurt spring book fair. Shortly thereafter he received a letter, no longer extant, from Alfonso de Valdés, who included with it the original Salamanca edition of 1528 together with the advice not to respond to it, but Erasmus in his response tells him that it arrived too late (Ep 2126). At any rate, he was able to read through it hastily, finding certain divergences from the Paris edition that were of little account, and dismissed the work as an embarrassment to the whole order, which would be exposed to the scorn of good and learned men. Valdés, who did not receive this letter in Spain until July, reassured him that the matter had been buried in oblivion within three or four days and no one could get hold of a copy. He assures Erasmus that the pamphlet was not written to respond to the *Epistola de un celoso de Erasmo* but that Carvajal, arriving in Salamanca fresh from Paris, thought he could make a name for himself by taking up his pen against Erasmus.[7]

The *Responsio adversus febricitantis libellum* answers Carvajal's strictures with vigour and enthusiasm spiced with merciless sarcasm.[8] Erasmus accuses his opponent of citing passages that do not exist in his works. He has frequent recourse to the *reductio ad absurdum*, as when he comments on Carvajal's definition of monasticism as the life of the Gospel and the observance of those things that Christ both taught and applied, which is merely an elaboration of Francis' own words at the beginning of the rule of the Franciscans. Erasmus retorts that it therefore follows that the apostles were monks and Christ was the first abbot. In the dialectical duel that takes place between the two men it must be said that the logic of the numerous syllogisms invented in the debate is often quite questionable.

The exchange of insults did not end there. Carvajal in his turn published in 1530 *Dulcoratio amarulentiarum Erasmicae responsionis ad apologiam*

* * * * *

7 Ep 2198:25–32

8 My translation is based on LB X 1673–84.

Fratris Lodovici Carvaiali (A Sweetening of the Bitter Contents of Erasmus' Answer to the Apology of Friar Luis Carvajal). A sweetening it was not, but rather another dosage more bitter than Erasmus' *amarulentiae* and more feverish than the previous invective. Indeed, Erasmus' answer to the *Apologia monasticae religionis* was more playful than vindictive, pointing out the ridiculous exaggerations and distortions of Carvajal's attack. But his opponent, humiliated by Erasmus' insinuations of his humble origins, boasts of his noble ancestry in a way hardly becoming to a Franciscan. For the rest the riposte is merely a lengthy and wearisome repetition of his first protestations. Erasmus did not deign to answer directly but addressed an open letter to the Franciscans in the form of a pamphlet published by Johann Faber Emmaeus at Freiburg. It was entitled *Epistola ad quosdam impudentissimos gracculos* (Letter to Certain Highly Impudent Jackdaws).[9] The letter was aimed not only at Carvajal but at another Franciscan enemy of his, Franz Titelmans, as well as the Franciscan Observants in general, who had been prominent among his accusers at the Valladolid convocation. The salutation of this scathing letter is 'Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam wishes a better frame of mind to certain friars without observance.'[10]

There is an echo of the Carvajal controversy in Erasmus' letters to Cristóbal and Pero Mexía of Seville, whose letters to him are no longer extant. Cristóbal, of whom very little is known, had reported that slanderous remarks were being circulated in Spain about him. In his answer (Ep 2299) Erasmus refers to his critics once again as jackdaws, who have been trying to undermine his standing in the courts of princes. He mentions that there are two Franciscans, without mentioning names, as arrogant as they are ignorant, who are stirring up things up against him, abandoning the simplicity of Francis and sinking back into worldliness. On the same day, 30 March 1530, Erasmus wrote a letter to his brother, Pero Mexía, a government official in Seville who was a staunch admirer of Erasmus, which is much longer and more specific. He singles out both Carvajal and Titelmans as his antagonists, who published their attacks without submitting them to the proper authorities for approval. Carvajal had violated the injunction of the inquisitor-general of Spain, Archbishop Alonso Manrique de Lara, not to publish attacks against Erasmus. To support his claims Erasmus cites sentences from letters

* * * * *

9 The proverbial meaning of a jackdaw is a dull-witted chatterbox who forces his own ignorance on others. *Adagia* I vii 22

10 Ep 2275. The translation of this letter follows immediately after the present translation of the *Responsio*.

of Manrique addressed to him, and informs Mexía that he has not read the *Dulcoratio* and has no intention of doing so. For Mexía's interest Erasmus lists some of the extravagant statements of Carvajal in this latest diatribe, which he considers as examples of utter stupidity. In closing he appends this cruel barb: 'If Francis were alive today I doubt that he would recognize Carvajal as a true son of his or wish to be praised by him.'[11] On the very next day Erasmus reported both Carvajal attacks to Manrique, emphasizing the defamatory character of the *Dulcoratio*, which he rightly maintained was against the rule of the Friars Minor.[12] He even recommends that disciplinary measures be taken against the clandestine Spanish printer who produced the original Salamanca edition of Carvajal's *Apologia monasticae religionis* in 1528. Erasmus made certain that these letters were made public, including them in the *Epistolae floridae* in 1531, but by this time the tide was turning against him in Spain. Carvajal became guardian of the convent of Jérez in 1535 and later of that of Seville and attended the early sessions of the Council of Trent. He produced a book that gained great renown, *De restituta theologia*, in which he continued to criticize Erasmus, especially his translations of the New Testament. The famous Spanish scholar Menéndez y Pelayo, no friend of Erasmus, says of him, 'Fray Luis de Carvajal es una de las figuras más nobles del Renacimiento español.'[13]

* * * * *

11 Ep 2300:156–7

12 The First Rule of the Friars Minor (1209) states: 'And let all the brothers take care not to calumniate anyone, nor to contest in words.' *The Writings of St. Francis of Assisi* trans Pascal Robinson (Philadelphia 1905) 45

13 Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo *Historia de los heterodoxos españoles* (Madrid 1882) 47

THE ANSWER OF DESIDERIUS ERASMUS TO THE PAMPHLET OF A CERTAIN FEVER-RIDDEN INDIVIDUAL

All is well. Finally, Luis de Carvajal has leapt into the midst of the fray to protect with his shield all holy and sacred religion against Goliath, alias Erasmus. And he is not of that breed of monks who, forgetful of their vows, live in luxury and wander idle through the world; no, not idle, but masterminds of the most pernicious disturbances. But they are members of that unsullied society of the Franciscans who, mortified in the flesh but vivified in the spirit, have laid aside, once and for all, all worldly desires (so he says), and repudiating worldly goods for the sake of holiness, meditate upon life in heaven while still on earth, according to the rule of the Gospel, to which the Franciscan rule is subject.[14] And all the while he is a man of no little learning since, as he claims, he is versed in logic, physics, and metaphysics. From him, therefore, one may judge all religious orders and sacred religion. But I must warn the reader not to make any order conform to the example of this writer. And it may be that the one who is enacting this play is neither a Franciscan nor a Luis, but to me, at least, whoever he is, he is a *Pantalabus*.[15] I am not going to respond to each criticism one by one but shall merely touch on certain topics, by which the rest may be judged. What he says in the preface is very clever: that when he was planning these attacks he was suffering from a grave fever so that he had no time to examine any books, and therefore whatever lies he tells may appear to be a lapse of memory, and if he speaks deliriously it can be attributed to his fever. But the truth of the matter, my dear Pantalabus, is that you should have entered such a contest in full possession of your faculties and armed with extensive readings.

First, he takes it for granted that I am doing all in my power to overturn sacred religion from its very foundations, as he says (8r), although I testify over and over again in my writings that I do not wish anything I write against pseudomonks for the purpose of admonition to be distorted into the defamation of good monks, and I nowhere condemn religious orders.[16] But if whoever dares to open his mouth against the vices of monks is an enemy

* * * * *

14 The very first sentence of the Rule of St Francis of Assisi reads: 'The rule and life of the Brothers Minor is this: to observe the holy Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.'

15 Alteration of Pantolabus, literally 'Grab-all,' the nickname of a well-known scrounger. Horace *Satires* 1.8.10–11

16 All references to the *Apologia monasticae religionis* are to the Paris edition of 1529.

of all monks, no one is more fierce an enemy than Saint Jerome, who spares neither bishops nor clerics nor holy virgins. Finally, this Luis himself is the enemy of all ranks of Christian life, as he lashes out from the pulpit against the lives of magistrates, married couples, soldiers, and workmen. But if he had resolved to defend the condition and profession of monks, the point of his stylus should have been directed against Luther, who purposely condemns the professions and vows of all monks and does so with such forceful and skilful arguments that he boasts that no one has arisen or will arise who can refute them, and many applaud him, crying that the whole race of monks has been overthrown. Why was it necessary, then, to brandish a weapon against me, who make it my mission to encourage monks to embrace true piety and do away with envy, with which they are now burdened, and recover their former favour with God and men. Why was it necessary, I say, to attack a person of good will and ignore such an enemy? Therefore, since the basis of this whole disputation is false, what is our Pantalabus doing but beating brass?

With similar impudence, on the opening page of the book he quotes eight statements as examples of anti-religious sentiment,[17] but they are his, not mine, for he certainly does not indicate the source, nor does he interpret my words as he should have, nor does he append judgment in good faith. He thinks that the prestige of the Franciscan name is so great that whatever he felt like writing would be accepted by the world as an oracle. But he is greatly mistaken. In this matter, at least, the world has woken up and has recovered its tongue. The first statement is: 'The rules of monks are human inventions.'[18] Where do I say this? 'In the dedicatory epistles of the Paraphrases,' he says, 'and elsewhere more than once.' Instigator! He had no time to consult books but he did have time to spread calumny. I give this exhortation on occasion: 'If the Franciscans carry around the rule of Francis, how much more will the Christian carry around the rule of the Gospel?' And if Benedict, Augustine, and Francis were men, what danger is there if someone should call their constitutions human and consider them inferior to the Gospel? Second: 'Monasticism is not piety,' which will be discussed in its

* * * * *

17 Actually, there are nine, but Erasmus does not discuss the last one, in which he is accused of saying that there are few good religious remaining. These statements appear at the very beginning of the book itself, after the letter of Juan de Zafra. The dedicatory letter to Don Lorenzo Suárez de Figueroa follows this list.

18 Carvajal later contrasts the rules of religious orders with the man-made laws of Draco, Solon or the Roman decemviri. Moses did not institute Jewish law but was the instrument of God. Similarly, Augustine, Francis, and Basil were inspired by God (5v–6r).

proper place. Third: 'It is imprudent to give away one's own possessions and seek those of others.' Where does Erasmus say this? In the dedicatory epistles to the *Paraphrases* and in the *Lingua*.[19] Look for it there, but you will find something else. Fourth: 'Let them sew shoes after the example of Paul, who sewed shoes at night, and they will not trouble people with their shameless begging, not without great loss to other poor people.' Where did I say this? In the same place, namely, nowhere. Fifth: 'The Dominicans are big bellies, born more for the plough than for the study of literature.' Where do I say this? In the dedicatory letter to the commentary of Luis Vives on Augustine's *City of God*. On the contrary, I do not speak there of the Dominicans in general, but of some of them who trumpet their stupid lies among the people. Here is the passage: 'And as soon as the news of this impious attempt trickled down to certain brothers of the Dominican order, etc.'[20] He makes this blunder continually so that he can interpret what is said against two or three monks as being said against all religious orders. But Ambrose and the rest of the doctors showed that this is the way of Scripture, which often so inveighs against evil men as if there were no good men, when in reality this reproach does not pertain to the society of the pious. I often testify that I am not speaking about everyone, sparing the good from calumny. Sixth: 'Ceremonies, in which our rabbis, imitators of Judaism, trust, have no life.' Where do I say this? In the *Paraphrases*.[21] Look for it there, for our fevered Pantalabus has not the time to do so. How could the *Paraphrase* criticize monks, when at that time monks did not yet exist? But if there are some monks or theologians today to whom what Christ says against the scribes and Pharisees is relevant, let them vent their indignation against the Gospel, not me. 'They are haters of good letters.' Where? In the *Antibarbari*.[22] Obviously there are some also today, but not all.

* * * * *

19 In his dedicatory epistles to prelates and princes Erasmus does not touch on such a subject. In *Lingua* he makes this passing remark: 'But how can men face themselves if they bring beggary upon their heads, and not only cast away their property, if they have any, but even bind themselves to idle beggary.' *Lingua* ASD IV-1 297:138–40; CWE 29 327

20 Ep 1309:47–9. It is true that Erasmus speaks of only a few Dominicans here, whom he had mentioned by name in a previous letter, Ep 1263. He goes on to say in this letter that he had no quarrel with the order, which is partly true since he respected it because it was less burdened with ceremonies, as he says in a long apologetic letter to the Dominican Vincentius Theodorici, theologian at Louvain (Ep 1196:293–5).

21 There is an indirect comparison of theologians, not monks, to rabbis in *Paraphrase on Luke* CWE 48 61.

22 CWE 23 25:10–12; 43:1–2

I wrote the *Antibarbari* forty-five years ago. 'It would be better if priests were allowed to marry.' Where did I say this? In the *Encomium of Marriage*, that is, in a declamatory and fictitious exercise, and yet the wording is not what Pantalabus gives.[23]

Having laid these foundations, he goes to the attack. 'The law was given through Moses, but it was the law of God, not of Moses; so the rules of Benedict, Francis, and Augustine were handed down through men, but they came from God.' What prevents us from saying that we attribute as much to them as we do to the divine Scriptures? But they are approved by the Roman Pontiff; I do not disapprove of them, and would that they were observed! They are approved as human institutions; they are not regarded as equal to divine laws. Hereupon, after introducing a splendid lie, that I do not accept anything unless it is taken from Holy Scripture, he proves to us from the Gospel and Paul that we must obey those who are placed over us and the magistrates. But who denied this? Obedience, the first vow of monks, is so commended as if the rest of Christians do not obey their bishops and pastors. In the *Enchiridion* I wrote 'Monasticism is not piety.' I did write this, but not only this; I added, 'It is a type of life that is profitable to some, but useless to others.'[24] Here in another splendid lie he says that I detest logic, physics, and metaphysics and all the arts except for rhetoric, and declares to his Maker how proficient he is in these disciplines. (6v) He says: 'He separates species from genus when he says that monasticism is not piety, as if one were to say "A man is not an animal."' (13r)

'A definition is not usually made through a negation.' (13r) Who would not stand in awe of this dialectician? Whenever he hears the word 'is' he thinks it is a definition. If I say that a mule is neither an ass nor a horse, but an animal that is a mixture of the two, am I speaking incorrectly? Likewise, a sound is not the collision of two bodies, but the noise that results from the collision. He says: 'The rule of Francis is this: to observe the gospel of Our Lord Jesus Christ. If this is piety, then monasticism is piety.' (13r) I answer: if what he says is true, all Christians have professed the Franciscan rule and all those who live according to the Franciscan rule are monks, above all the apostles. I omit the callous insults which a man dead to the world uses in violently attacking his brother, whom he does not know; I omit the verbal quibbling

* * * * *

23 The opinion is phrased more cautiously: 'In my view it would not be ill-advised for the interests and morals of mankind if the right of wedlock were also conceded to priests and monks, if circumstances required it.' CWE 26 137

24 CWE 66 127 / ASD V-8 300:123–4

that the word monk means solitary, and the monastic life is solitary, although this designation has nothing to do with Franciscans and Dominicans; that piety is not the simple profession of piety but a feeling of the mind embracing the love of God and neighbour. If whatever a monk does is piety, then it will be piety to lie, to calumniate, to inveigh violently against your neighbour, which he does in this whole book. He who has not laid aside the passions of the world cannot take refuge here; he who professes that he has renounced the passions of the world from time to time is not a monk. 'I call doctors of theology asses,' he says. I called one person by this name, and only once, as I recall. What does this have to do with the status of theologians? Would that there were fewer! 'I call religious men Pharisees and sycophants.' You are lying, Pantalabus; I never considered such persons religious as you portray yourself. 'I call magnates and kings tyrants.' Where, you imbecile? Were there no kings who were tyrants? And if anything is said in general against the unchecked power of princes, does that imply the criticism of individual princes? You say that I call the Emperor unfair in a letter that I wrote to Francis, the most Christian King of France. (8v) There is no detail of other people's affairs that these people dead to the world do not pry into! They know what Juno says to Jupiter at night. Here I ask you, reader, observe carefully the naiveté of a man who lives purely by the rule of the Gospel, ie the rule of Francis. The words in the letter to the king which he cites are these: 'Although some people think the terms of the peace are harsh, not to say unfair, yet I trust that he who guides all human affairs will bring about a happy outcome through his hidden and inscrutable purposes.'[25] Where, Pantalabus, do I make the Emperor unfair? I say that to some people, obviously the French, these conditions seem harsh, indeed unfair, something I do not want to say, although others do not remain silent.[26] And I say it is unfair, not because it is unjust, but because it is heavy and burdensome, as Virgil said,[27] and we call something fair when it eases the harshness of the law. So

* * * * *

25 Ep 1722:18–21

26 Carvajal was attempting in this letter to blame Erasmus for inciting Francis I not to accept the terms of peace offered in the treaty of Madrid of 14 January 1526, which entailed the ceding of the duchy of Burgundy to Charles V. The truth is that Francis never intended to obey those terms but had been forced to sign the treaty in order to secure his release from prison. Erasmus, as a natural-born subject of the emperor and still officially an imperial councilor, did not want to appear to have favoured Francis, but merely to have offered words of solace to the king in his ill fortune.

27 Virgil *Georgics* 1 164

we call them fair conditions, not just, but humane and moderate, otherwise the law of war is whatever the victor prescribes for the defeated. Finally, I am writing to the French King, who declared in writing what he thought of these conditions. Yet I do not recommend him to remove these conditions but rather I offer him consolation and encourage him to suffer adverse fortune with equanimity and not to be averse to a peaceful agreement. But our friend Pantalabus expends so much energy on logic, physics, and metaphysics that he has forgotten about grammar. So, according to Pantalabus I make the emperor unjust. Those who hold fast to justice exact the most unjust conditions because they do not moderate the rigour of the law with equity. There, reader, you have the tricks of the pure and genuine Franciscan.

Having completed this stage, our Pantalabus adds: 'I dare to say that the pillage and burning that befell Rome last year and the massacres of the French and Spaniards that took place around Rome came about through Erasmus and other flatterers of kings.' (8v)[28] Pantalabus dares to say this, for what would he not dare? I wrote to the most Christian King of France only once and I counsel nothing but concord. To Henry, King of England, defender of the Catholic faith, I wrote several times, but singing the same refrain. I do the same in letters to the illustrious King of Poland, Sigismund, and to King Ferdinand of Hungary and Bohemia, and likewise to the Emperor Charles, whom I exhorted so insistently to a peaceful agreement that in his last letter he gave signs of resentment.[29] He solemnly asserted that hitherto he had made such efforts in behalf of peace that for the future he preferred to declare what he would do in deeds rather than in words and that I should pray God that what he was undertaking would turn out well: this is how I set emperors against each other! Whose writings cry out more strongly against war or recommend the concord of princes more zealously than mine? Who is less involved in politics than I? The Roman calamity occurred before anyone here suspected that it would happen. In what way could I have averted it? But with contempt for the morality of princes, Pantalabus dares to say this. But this same man who would dare to burn down a city would dare to poison a man to whom he bore ill-will. But since such an atrocious crime is no less foreign to my life than to my writings, he knew he would not gain belief. So

* * * * *

28 A reference to the sack of Rome in May 1527 carried out by the mutinous troops of Charles v

29 The emperor wrote: 'There is no reason for anyone to doubt that we have acted vigorously to the best of our ability thus far to promote peace in public affairs.' Ep 1920:28–9

he added these words in the margin: 'There is no mention here of the discord between the most Christian King and the Emperor that Erasmus appended to his letter. You will find these words in the Spanish copies.' (8v) What punishment is suitable for this slanderer? And he either feigns or boasts that he is a Franciscan of the strictest observance and the protector of all holy religions. He continues, saying that I make priests, bishops, cardinals, and popes now impious soldiers, now tyrannical despots, now wolves, now asses, now tavern-keepers. Where? Search my books, reader, for Pantalabus had no time to consult books because of his fever. And if such things were said of bad priests on occasion, what crime would there be, since Christ calls them ravenous wolves and Paul calls them dogs. Concerning authors who are regarded with contempt it is not worth the trouble to respond since he thinks that it is a personal insult when someone disagrees with you, as if the very authors he mentions do not disagree among themselves very often. And if something is said against one or two Spaniards he thinks that all of Spain has been denigrated. This he has learned from his logic.

The accusations increase in number. Commenting on the second chapter of Matthew I say that the evangelists sometimes had a lapse of memory. (9r) What is it to have a lapse of memory? To be overcome by sleepiness. Indeed, read my annotations and you will see that I do not attribute a lapse of memory to the apostles, but I cite the words of Jerome in which he declares that some people believed one word was put for another by the evangelists.[30] I add nothing of my own except this: 'If perhaps a lapse was detected, that through a human failing one word was put for another, since it does not affect the general meaning, in my view this would not jeopardize the credibility of all of Scripture. On other matters I give no opinion. But they were men, I say, and they could err.'[31] This is true, but in things on which the explanation of our faith or of the truth of the Gospel did not depend. But read my annotation and you will see his clear misrepresentation. He continues his campaign of calumny: he says that with near blasphemous words I attribute human feelings and a certain ostentation to the Virgin mother. (9r)[32] Where, Pantalabus?

* * * * *

30 ASD VI-5 98:763

31 Annotation on Matt 2:6 ASD VI-5 100:840–4. Erasmus quotes Jerome's commentary on a passage in the prophet Micah in the Vulgate that differs greatly from the Greek and the Hebrew, which he attributes to a lack of memory. Jerome *Commentarium in Michaeum* 2 5 1–2. Also *Epistola* 57 CSEL 54 503

32 Carvajal refers to the wedding feast of Cana but the passage discussed by Erasmus is Matthew 12:47, in which Christ's mother and his brethren are seeking to speak to him while he is speaking to the crowds. ASD VI-5 218:626–9

In the first chapter of John [he says]. You will find nothing of the sort either in the *Paraphrase* or in the *Annotations*. But let us allow this fever-racked individual some indulgence. I note somewhere that Chrysostom spoke of Mary as if she were not entirely free of human feelings, and Augustine attributed distrust to her, but it was only slight and short-lived.[33] Such an opinion does not have my approval. And yet a person can be in error or doubt with no sin entailed.

I won't mention the frenzied insults of the man, in which he is so crazed with anger that you would say the fever itself is speaking. To demonstrate that I am vexed because I am not numbered among the four doctors of the church he brings forth the symbol on my ring in which there is a figure of Terminus. (9v) I added the inscription: '*Concedo nulli Terminus*' ('I, Terminus, cede to no man'), which is an iambic dimeter. If you turn it around, it becomes a trochaic verse of the same number of feet. '*Terminus concedo nulli.*' And in the molten image of Terminus the edge reads: 'The boundary-stone is the end of a long life' [original in Greek] and likewise in Latin 'Death is the ultimate boundary of things,' meaning that death cedes to no one, and I remind myself that the last day of life is at hand, as Prudentius wrote: 'The end approaches, and already God brings nigh the day that borders on old age.'[34] I gave expression to this also in a published work. So here it is Terminus who says to all: 'I cede to no man,' not Erasmus. But Pantalabus fiercely accuses me: 'What are you saying, Erasmus? Do you not cede to Clichtove, to Hilary, to Cyprian, to Budé, to Nebrija, to Thomas, to Augustine?' (9v) If you wish me to respond in my own name, there is no one to whom I do not cede. If you wish me to respond in the name of Terminus, ie of death, I shall say: 'I cede not to lions nor to elephants; I cede not to monarchs nor supreme pontiffs. I have not ceded to prophets and apostles, and finally I have not ceded to Francis himself, not even to Christ himself.' Let him go now and talk about the arrogance of my Terminus. Though one could hardly imagine a more absurd topic, it is amazing how he hammers away at it, how he bandies it about, what melodramas he creates in his preposterous rage, as befits one racked with fever. He compares my prolific writing with Thomas, Augustine, Jerome, and Hilary, so that at least on this point Terminus will cede, as if I were contending with them. Next he denies me the ability to write correct Latin (10r); he denies me the gift of eloquence, or if any exists, he considers it a rivulet far removed from true eloquence. He criticizes me because

* * * * *

33 Chrysostom *Homilia in Matthaeum* 44 (45) 1 PG 57 464
34 Prudentius *Cathemerinon prologus* 4–5

sometimes I include two or three Greek words in my writings (11r), although this is the peculiar trait of Budé in his Greco-Latin works. My wise opponent approves his practice, but criticizes me. Finally, this chaste and true-blooded Franciscan prefers children to read the plays of Plautus (11r), which are replete with bad examples and obscene jokes, rather than my *Colloquies*, in which there are so many things that lead to true piety. He said: 'Erasmus raves against the saints and the devotees of the saints,' but he appropriately added: 'I am lying.' For he lies shamelessly when neither jokingly nor seriously did I say anything except against the superstitious worship of the saints, while I point out true devotion to them.

But from charming digressions of this kind he returns to the heart of the matter to demonstrate from his logic that the monastic life is piety. Since I had written: 'Monasticism is not piety,' Luther dared to say: 'Monasticism is impiety.'[35] Likewise if I were to say that there is no remedy in a goblet of wine, another would immediately say it contained poison? Who could reason in such a way except one who is long versed in logic? I said it is not piety, but I add things which amply exclude what Luther says, namely, that monasticism is impiety. For impiety is a kind of life that is not suitable for anyone. One who is not a monk can be pious but it is not permitted that one should be impious in any way of life. He adds that I boast in the *Spongia* that Luther culled a good part of his immoderate teachings from my writings. (12r)[36] I know this is a splendid lie even before I look at his book, since up to now I have strenuously rebutted all those who have given voice to this nonsense. After that this fever-ridden man, abandoning what he had begun, takes up the cry from the *Lord's Prayer*, 'hallowed be thy name' as if, eclipsing the name of God, I try to commend my name to the world. (12r)[37] Let him sing this song to his Franciscans, who exalt their order excessively, and according to him occupy the first rank of the church.

Again after a brief respite he returns to the attack and makes the Emperor into a monk, claiming that he is waging a military campaign under the cross

* * * * *

35 'Ecce fundamentum monasticorum votorum impietas.' Luther *De fundamentis devotariorum.* WA 8 573 #95

36 No such statement exists in the *Spongia.*

37 Carvajal must be perversely interpreting a phrase from Erasmus' catechetical commentary on the Lord's Prayer, in which he says: 'Let the glory of your name shine forth in our actions as in the angels and in all your other creatures. Just as those who contemplate this world can infer the greatness of the Creator from his wonderful work, so may those who do not know you be stirred by our example.' *Precatio dominica* CWE 69 64

of Saint James, and together with the Emperor he makes various noblemen of Spain into monks. (12v) Concerning this matter he declares: 'Monasticism is the life of the Gospel, the observance of those things that Christ both taught and adopted.' (12v) This is a definition derived from pure dialectic, which Erasmus did not learn. But the dialecticians also tell us that a definition is not sound if it does not correspond with what is defined. Therefore, if this definition is valid, it follows that the apostles and the disciples of the apostles were monks, and that Christ himself was the first abbot of monks. Then it also follows that monks who do not fulfil what this definition embraces are anything but monks. They are more like asses, as he calls them. But if this is true, by God immortal! what a paucity of monks there will be! In addition, since he wants the word monk to be used just as we say priest, bishop, abbot, cardinal, pope, all those who do not show themselves to be what they profess to be lose the honour of the title. Likewise, neither will a magistrate be a magistrate, nor a prince a prince, and it will be permitted to disregard their orders, and the people will not be obliged to pay revenue to monks if they live a bad life. What has been bequeathed to monks is not owed to those who are not monks. Finally, he who does not fulfil what he professed in baptism will not even be called a Christian. Therefore, just as Christianity is the profession of the Christian militia, so monasticism is the profession of a more perfect evangelical life, but according to some human rule approved by the church, as they are called today. Otherwise if anyone today should live obediently under the bishop and his pastor, live in the greatest continence, and having given all to the poor, should sustain himself by begging or manual work, dressing in simple attire, but that of a layman, will he be called a monk? He will be so called according to the definition of this dialectician. In the end since no one knows men's secrets, it will not be possible to know with certainty whether a person is a monk or not. But if according to the proverb, 'The habit does not make the monk,' he who is a slave of the flesh is not a monk, why do they call one who has only put off his habit an apostate, ie a deserter from the monastic life, even if he lives more holily than he did before, while they consider a whore-monger, a drunkard, a slanderer, and a sycophant a monk just because of his habit or cincture or his sandals? Therefore, since in the eyes of God one who lives contrary to the way a monk should live is not a monk, but among men those who wear a prescribed type of clothing are considered monks, why was I not allowed to speak the way all people speak? Again if monasticism is perfect piety, whoever is a monk will possess perfect piety, just as whoever is white is colored since whiteness is a color, and whoever does not live piously will not be a monk. Accordingly, the revenue destined for monks will not be paid to monks who live at variance with their rule of life.

At this point, digressing again because of his fever, he recounts an amusing saying of a certain Franciscan, whose name comes from horns:[38] 'You will crush the lion and the dragon,' the word lion referring to Luther and dragon to Erasmus, as if anyone could not similarly twist the sense of the plagues of Egypt and those referred to in the Apocalypse to apply to monastic orders. He says, 'But Erasmus says that the monks in their choir stalls bray with the voices of asses.' The *Folly* says something similar,[39] but not against those who humbly sing spiritual hymns to God, but against those who bellow out the Psalms in an amazing vocal exhibition with no understanding and without feeling, in such a way that the words cannot be understood because of the bellowing. I condemn that bellowing, and we hear such sounds everywhere among our own orders. Among the Spaniards I think they modulate their chanting with angelic voices.[40] And then again he calls me an atheist, a Diodorus,[41] a Diagoras,[42] and a Lucian,[43] sometimes an Epicurus,[44] no doubt on the authority of Luther, which I would admit is weighty for him in this instance if in turn he would admit that it is of importance to him in everything he writes against all monks. But he introduces a manifest lie saying that I refer to all monks. (16r) And yet the *Folly* begins this way: 'Since a good many of them are far removed, [from religion] etc.'[45] Tell me, Pantalabus, master logician, does one who says 'a good many' mean 'all'? Next, when I say, 'Then when they repeat by rote the psalms they don't understand, etc,'[46] I criticize the bellowing of such men as these, not the chants of all monks. Dialectic

* * * * *

38 Petrus a Cornibus, or Pierre de Cornes (d 1519), warden of the Paris Franciscan convent from 1528 to 1532, was a renowned preacher and served on committees of the faculty of theology. He was a teacher of Carvajal.

39 'bray like asses in church,' *Praise of Folly* CWE 27 131

40 Perhaps Erasmus was aware of the fame of the singing of Gregorian chant in the Benedictine Monastery of Santo Domingo de Silos, founded in the eleventh century.

41 Diodorus Cronus (d 284 BC) was a virtuoso dialectician, famed for his sophistry.

42 Diagoras of Melos, lyric poet active in Athens in the last decades of the fifth century, was renowned for his atheism.

43 Lucian of Samosata (born c AD 120), famous satirist, much admired by Erasmus. Together with Thomas More Erasmus translated numerous works of his into Latin, a collection published in Paris in 1506.

44 Epicurus (died Athens 270 BC), moral philosopher who founded the Epicurean school of philosophy. He did not believe in the existence of a providential god.

45 *Praise of Folly* CWE 27 130

46 Ibidem 131

teaches the art of finding out the truth, but Pantalabus seems to have learned instead the art of lying.

He lies with pure impudence saying that I criticize the church, which prescribes particular psalms in solemn religious ceremonies, and that I wish that anyone should be free to choose whether he wants to pray or not. (14v) Where did Erasmus teach this? Nowhere, but it is sufficient that Pantalabus said: 'I [ie Erasmus] dare to say.' Digressing from there, he paints for us the life and studies of pious monks. Would that this example were true of most monks! But to what purpose does he pass all this in review? As if we ever condemn the good actions of monks, rather than exhort all of them to such conduct. But with considerable arrogance he adds: 'This is our monastic way of life.' (14v) But is it also monasticism and the evangelical life to write infamous libels, packed with countless lies and calumnies? Pantalabus adds feverishly: 'At the Council of Constance the church approved the rule of Francis, but Erasmus asserts the contrary.'[47] (15v) What is more shameless than this lie? Does he who prefers the rule of the Gospel, that is, who prefers Christ to Francis, condemn a man-made rule? He praises the piety of the Emperor for assigning the task of the inquisition to the most Reverend Archbishop of Seville. (15r) He did commit this task to him, but why did he? Because these men dead to the world had stirred up such unruly tumults, first at the court of the Emperor, then it was the Franciscans of Salamanca, then certain Dominicans, that if he did not act, the disturbance would have encompassed all of Spain. Such is the unscrupulousness of those who profess the greatest modesty that they are hardly loved by anyone, but are feared by great leaders because they are marvellously adept at stirring up sedition. When it came to the actual charges, then it became clear how dead they were to the world and how learned in theology. Their defamatory pamphlet exists and my response exists. Let them make use of them. But this fever-racked madman had no time to read, he had time only to give vent to his ill-temper. The Most Reverend Alfonso Fonseca, Archbishop of Toledo, said, if what Pantalabus tells us is true: 'If Erasmus is a heretic, let him be burned.' (15v) 'O truly Catholic utterance, worthy of the Primate of all of Spain!' he said. I won't mention here the letter of the Archbishop to me.[48] What else could a

* * * * *

47 At the Council of Constance (1414–18) the Franciscan order was divided up into Conventuals and Observants.

48 Erasmus received a letter from Alfonso de Fonseca, Archbishop of Toledo, dated 24 April 1527, promising him his full support and praising him for his indefatigable labours on behalf of pious and Christian studies.

pious and prudent man answer to such a frenzied crowd, crying out nothing but 'Heretic, heretic, heretic!' both publicly and privately, even in conversation with pimps and whores?' He did not pronounce judgment against me, but drove off the relentless barking of dogs.

To skip over again the many more than scurrilous reproaches made by Pantalabus – that by testimony of Luther I am an atheist (22v),[49] that there is nothing I do not condemn in the members of religious orders, although I only draw attention to vices that make them irreligious; that I invent stories to vilify them, although I even suppress what people relate in the market places and at banquets. He presents an amusing tale, plainly worthy of a Franciscan. 'In Sicily,' he says, 'when a Frenchman was reigning there, a certain lawyer, feigning madness, took up a reed and as if in a fit of madness whispered into the ears of the Frenchmen that on the feast day of St John the Sicilians would be slaughtered, and into the ears of the Sicilians that the French would be slaughtered, and so it was that on the feast day of St John no Frenchman escaped for in the meantime he had recruited an army of Sicilians.[50] So Erasmus, assuming the role of a fool in *The Praise of Folly*, has taken up the pen and destroyed the whole church by his pranks and his jokes.' (17r) How much more justly could this be turned against a Franciscan like Pantalabus? For nothing is lacking to their cult but ears: there is no home that they do not penetrate, no monastery, no court of princes. The facts themselves reveal what they instill and the common people are well aware of it, so that I need not mention it here. I shall merely make this response, that my jokes contain more piety than certain subtle speculations of Scotus. I have a good whiff of who the perpetrator of pamphlets of this sort is, a Jew, a man completely out of his mind, so that nothing is coherent even in his writing.[51] This is the way this actor, adorned with his woolen fillets, performs his play,

* * * * *

49 In *The Bondage of the Will* Luther calls Erasmus a follower of Epicurus: 'You foster in your heart a Lucian, or some other pig from Epicurus' sty, who having no belief in God himself, secretly ridicules all who have a belief and confess it.' *Luther and Erasmus: Free Will and Salvation*. *Bondage of the Will*, tr Philip S. Watson (Philadelphia 1969) 109. WA 18, 605

50 Erasmus has altered the story somewhat. In Carvajal's version it is a question of a single Frenchman and a single Sicilian, which makes more sense.

51 At first Erasmus correctly thought Carvajal was Spanish (Ep 2110:29–30) but later conjectured that he was from Brabant of Gelderland (Ep 2126:106–7). It was not until Alfonso Valdés assured him that he was Spanish by birth and was living in Salamanca (Ep 2198:16–17) that the confusion was eliminated. 'Carvajal' was in fact a fairly common Sephardic Jewish name, but this Luis de Carvajal from Orosio came from a noble Christian family of Andalusia.

and he will be treated as he deserves if he will reveal himself honestly. For he is the principal author of all these tumults. My jokes do not harm anyone except that they free youth from superstition, exhorting to true piety, which is not advantageous for certain pseudomonks; hence those tears.[52] It is not enough for them to be good Christians unless they are Franciscans. But the *Folly* calls the action of begging practiced by monks shameless, and describes to us the humility of certain people who live by begging.[53] In order not to wrong the humble beggars I used the word 'shameless,' obviously rebuking those who always present themselves with their box on board ship, in the inns, in meeting places, at banquets, extorting money with scurrilous impudence. They will not go away unless they are given something, drinking all the while and playing the clown with their inane witticisms. The *Folly* makes fun of these people, who put on the cowl not for love of piety but for the sake of their stomachs. They are an embarrassment to all good monks. As for the others, so far am I from hating them that I often share with them what little I have. But if there are no bad monks in Spain, it is to be congratulated; with us, sad to say, there is an immense throng of them. Now he recites to us a catalogue of learned monks, among whom our clever informant mentions Pellicanus, who long ago took a wife and is the colleague of Zwingli. (20v)[54] He does so as if we condemn the whole order, or as if because of a few who are worthy of approval all should be approved, and lastly, as if they would not have been virtuous if they had not been monks. But if they pride themselves on a few good and learned men, why are they not ashamed of the huge number of evil and ignorant members of the order, in a word, men like Pantalabus? But he immediately retorts that there was a Judas among the apostles (28r), and so it is unfair to persecute the religious orders because of one or two degenerate monks, although there are so many thousands of monasteries where religious discipline is so lacking that it is not possible for anyone to be pious, while even in those where some reforms have been made there are so few who are spiritual. Nevertheless, he thinks he is being wonderfully clever when he gives little importance to one or two degenerate monks. (26v) Would that what he says were true. The world would easily

* * * * *

52 *Adagia* I iii 68

53 'Their bellowing results in a great loss to all other beggars.' *Praise of Folly* CWE 27 131

54 Conradus Pellicanus (1478–1556) collaborated with Erasmus on his edition of the works of Jerome, but later Erasmus accused him of disloyalty and treachery for spreading false rumours about his views on the Eucharist. In February Pellicanus left Basel for Zürich and was closely associated with Zwingli.

find respite from all this tumult. He would have been laughed at if instead of one or two he had said ten or twelve thousand. There are many who fast, who rise up in the middle of the night, who chant, who wear a prescribed habit, but among them how few are there who are free of hatred, envy, conceit, anger, lust for revenge, self-confidence, and other spiritual vices to which Pantalabus says monks are not subject?

Although on the subject of ceremonies he himself admits that what I say is true, namely that no ceremonies, that is to say, no outward signs or practices, confer salvation unless the spirit is present, yet he blabbers away as if we were diametrically opposed to each other. (21v) Finally, he disputes about good letters, which learned men commonly call humane letters. (23r) He wants this term to have wider application and claims that I do not know logic, physics, metaphysics, and ethics, although I began to learn these subjects as an eleven-year-old boy, and my writings bear testimony that I was more than a little versed in this type of author. But where does the evangelical rule of Francis prescribe that Minorites should learn logic, physics, and metaphysics, disciplines which Scotus made so obscure, from Aristotle and Averroes (23r)? Or what is there in this pamphlet that is suggestive of any liberal learning? He absurdly teaches that one cannot have rhetoric without dialectic, because they are one by nature, yet he grants himself rhetoric but takes away dialectic. (23v) Let us attribute this to the fever. He says that rhetors treat both sides of an argument with equal probability, but not dialecticians. On the contrary, this ability befits no one more than the dialectician. What else do Thomas, Durandus, and Scotus do when they argue on both sides of a dispute concerning even the most established doctrines, and Scotus sometimes more forcefully in favor of the more disapproved thesis? He adds a lie, saying that I prefer rhetoric and disparage dialectic. I disapprove of wrangling sophistic, not dialectic. Nor do I ever prefer good letters to more grave disciplines, but I wish one to draw close to the other, which is what Pantalabus argues, and yet he thunders against me.

Up to this point he presents a fine defence of the obedience and poverty of monks. There remains chastity, as if I condemn the chastity of monks rather than their impure celibacy, that is, inchastity. To prove it he says I inveigh insanely against Jerome. (25r) Where do I do this, Pantalabus? I state that in his attack on Jovinian Jerome sometimes seems rather unfair to marriage. Does not Jerome say this of marriage: 'What kind of good is that which is good by comparison with something worse?'[55] Or this: 'If it is good not to touch a

* * * * *

55 *Adversus Iovinianum* 1.7 PL 23 229

woman, ie take a wife, then it is bad to touch a woman,'[56] and other similar opinions. Is this to inveigh against Jerome? Therefore the bishops who urged Jerome to make a palinode were even more insane.[57] If opinions about marriage which we read in Jerome were found in my writings, the theologians would clamour that I am blaspheming a sacrament of the church.

He said that I invent a thousand falsehoods against lovers of chastity. (25r) You buffoon, whoever you are, where do I make the slightest derisory remark against lovers of chastity? 'Erasmus' harlot reveals this,' he said.[58] This is very much like what he said previously, that I had brought about a dissension between the Emperor and a Frenchman and that I was the cause of the sack of Rome. But I am not quite certain of what he is saying. Perhaps this man with a smattering of physics is speaking in physical terms. Physicists call the little sac hanging beneath the bladder, which contains the testicles, *scortum*.[59] Perhaps a man of Franciscan simplicity is suggesting that my sexual powers are failing. But I love old age for no other reason than that it has removed this annoyance from me, or at least lessened it. But of what importance is it to me what such a man says or suggests, who does not hesitate to charge me with the dissension between the Emperor and the King of France, and then all the destruction that took place in and around Rome? But, tell me, what did Erasmus' harlot reveal? That in the *Exomologesis* I inserted a fabricated tale about a certain pastor of consecrated virgins who confessed that he had sexual intercourse with two hundred of them.[60] But for what purpose

* * * * *

56 Ibidem

57 This may refer to the passage at Gal 2:14 in which Paul rebuked Peter at Antioch for imposing circumcision on converted Gentiles. Jerome interpreted this as an opportunity to condemn, through Peter, the practices of others. Augustine was of the view that Jewish rites were not like pagan rites and had to be respected. Paul reprimanded Peter not for observing the customs handed down from his fathers, but for his attempt to impose these customs on gentiles in such a way as to imply that the grace of God was not sufficient in itself for salvation. Towards the end of the letter Augustine bids Jerome to sing a palinode. Jerome *Epistolae* 67 PL 22 648-50. Cf Peter Brown *Augustine of Hippo* (Berkeley 2000) 450.

58 In the colloquy *Adolescens et scortum* (The Young Man and the Harlot) Lucretia ridicules Sophronius for his conversion to a chaste life. CWE 39 382–6

59 Erasmus is playing on the words *scortum* (harlot) and *scrotum*, which could easily be confused by metathesis.

60 Erasmus says he heard this story from a certain theologian, *Exomologesis* ASD V-8 368:413–15 / CWE 67 38. He was criticized for recounting this tale in a book that went under the name of 'Godefridus Ruysius Taxander' in which Erasmus' views on confession were fiercely attacked. His reply, entitled *Manifesta mendacia,*

do I tell such a story? To encourage inchastity? On the contrary I tell it as an abominable and unusual crime. With what proofs does Pantalabus conclude that what I wrote is without basis? Listen to the dialectician. 'If your native women are so free and easy, how could it happen that a pastor found so many virgins?' (25r) As if there is any woman so immoral that she was never a virgin. 'Who would believe this of an old man,' he said 'a religious who daily approached Christ's table?' (25r) I did not write 'old man,' and how could the perpetrator of such crimes be religious? And yet I did not even say he was a monk. I do not know how many times he approached Christ's table. But he was an old man when he confessed this long hidden crime. What is so strange if one who has moved around to many places during his lifetime has corrupted so many virgins? And this fellow makes fun of it as if I wrote that two hundred virgins were violated in a few nights by one man. Would that there were fewer who approached Christ's table with impure conscience! And he had the Franciscan sense of propriety to call this man a Priapus. (25r) But it was a Dominican professor of theology in Antwerp, whose name was John, if I remember correctly (he was one-eyed, and perhaps he is still living), about twenty-six years ago, in the house of the doctor, Nicholas Middelbury. He gave the name of a Louvain theologian as the source of his story, who lamented the fact that he had sent the man away without absolution after he confessed these things and ordered him to return, but he never returned. For he was afraid that driven by despair he might have killed himself. That is the way Erasmus fabricated this tale.

But if these things are kept in check by confession, the world is full of stories about betrayed secrets and heinous crimes listened to under the seal of confession which are not divulged by me. In a book on confession could no mention be made of any shameful act? Then it will not be permitted to a doctor to speak of foul diseases. How much more horrible things others tell, who have written books on confession, which my sense of shame kept me from mentioning. And in the meantime he acts as if I had taken a wife and invited other priests to marry. Let him produce one out of so many whom I encouraged to take a wife. Does he ask me whether I think it is right that

* * * * *

was never published but it was resurrected by Erika Rummel from a manuscript in the Royal Library at Copenhagen. She published a transcript of it in *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* 20–2 (1990) 210–29, and an English translation in CWE 71 114–31. She later published the Latin critical text, ASD IX-4 338–55. Erasmus defends himself against slander for including this tale, protesting that he indicates neither the person nor the place. *Manifest Lies* ASD IX-4 341–2:98–101 / CWE 71 119 12

priests after nocturnal sexual embraces should approach the most sacred body of Christ? I think not, but neither is it fitting that those who have undigested food in their stomach or are drunk or overcome with anger and hatred should approach the altar. But I in turn ask Pantalabus whether he thinks it is right that priests and monks after sexual encounters with a stinking whore should approach Christ's table, not to speak of even fouler things. For I speak of those who cannot control themselves. If they do not have a wife, I leave it to others to imagine what they do. And why is it necessary that a husband should have sexual intercourse every night with his wife? If the church were to permit priests to have wives, they would not be defiled by their chaste embraces when the ceremonies of the Law have been abolished and there are priests who rarely offer sacrifice. But this man thinks that a man is defiled only by sexual intercourse, when one who approaches the altar full of spiritual vices is much more defiled. How purely our Pantalabus, defiled by so many lies, so many intrigues, such scurrilous talk, such great arrogance, approaches the sacred table. Whether he is free from contact with women, I don't know. Certainly he has an impure tongue.

Now listen again to the dialectical argument. 'Erasmus vents his spleen against the Nicene Council.' How so? 'Because he says that if it is permitted priests to marry, many evils will be avoided.' What comes after that? 'For the same reason' he says, 'belief in the Trinity should not have been preached to the Saracens and to Arius because from this preaching they became more impious.' (25v) But, my good Pantalabus, no one can be an Arian without being impious and blasphemous, but a married man can be both pious and religious. He asks who would be lovers of chastity if monks were to copulate with wives? (26r) This sounds like he is saying that only monks loved chastity, or as if whoever lives chastely must be a monk. Equally stupid are the words that follow: 'Who would be imitators of the virginity of Christ? Who, finally, would be castigators of lust?' (26r) Unless we are to admit that the Virgin Mother together with the whole chorus of virgins was a nun, these words are utterly stupid. And in the meantime, they imagine that all priests and monks are virgins and free of lust when inchastity is found nowhere more than among celibates. With what eloquence Saint Jerome instructed virgins, although he himself was not a virgin? With what effrontery Saint Augustine teaches others continence although he had two concubines? With what assurance does Peter exhort to chastity, although he had a wife? With what authority does Paul preach virginity although it is probable that he had a wife? He continues: 'If monks were shoe-makers, who would meditate on the divine law? who would be the searchers after truth, who the vanquishers of heresy, who the preachers against false dogmas?' (26r) You boastful fool! There are so many bishops in the world, so many thousands of theologians

who can see to these things better than any monks, while they, the monks, think there would be no one if there were no monks. Does John, Bishop of Rochester,[61] seem to you to be a monk, or all the confreres of the Sorbonne? Or does the King of England seem to you to be a monk? All of these fight against impious dogmas. But what he adds is even more arrogant: 'That Spirit which instructs the hearts of the simple has been given to us.' (26r) Rather, the spirit of Satan has been given to the likes of you, who pose fierce opposition to those who try to restore the vigour of the Gospel and bring back Pharisaism to us instead of Christianity. The lying spirit in his mouth adds that I do not distinguish evil men from good but rebuke both, and that because of one or two degenerates I condemn all (26v), although so many times do I proclaim that I do not harm the good but admonish the wicked, and do not think the good should suffer harm because of so many thousands of evil men. Mark well the mentality and effrontery of this Franciscan. A similar falsehood is his claim that I am the only one to oppose the monks vociferously, when the world has long clamoured against them and, as it seems, will never be quiet until it has driven them out, or they will return to a disciplined way of life and the pursuit of true piety. I made reference to the scarcity of good men, 'At the same time they have become useless.' (26v) What opinion will we have of the others when this champion of them all behaves in this way? He tells us how many good things the Minorites[62] are doing in New Spain and in other recently discovered territories (27r), as if we carp at their good deeds or those of anyone else, or as if no one else could do the same thing the Minorites are doing. It is no great accomplishment to baptize children, it is a great thing to instruct them in the philosophy of Christ, if it is done sincerely, for as in the past pseudo-apostles preached the Gospel, not sincerely, but for love of gain and power, so perhaps these men are seeking to gain something under the guise of piety. Who would dare now to despise the Franciscans after the boy Jesus and the Virgin Mary together help their preaching? But the boy Jesus withdrew himself when they wanted to adore him. O new modesty! Even now does Jesus shrink back from being adored, although when he was in mortal flesh he did not prohibit anyone

* * * * *

61 John Fisher (1469–1535), was made bishop of Rochester in 1504. By 1513 he was in frequent correspondence with Erasmus, especially concerning the Scripture and humane letters, and in later years about the problem of Luther. He was executed on Tower Hill on 22 June 1535 for repudiating the Supremacy Act of Henry VIII.

62 Another name for Friars Minor, members of the Franciscan order

from adoring him? But the Minorites preferred to be burned rather than abjure Christ. As if the soldiers of Gereon[63] and numerous others did not do this. If they do pious deeds they do so as good Christians not as Minorites. It would be more modest to mention these things not as if they were done by the Minorites but by Christ, the servant of his servants. So Paul is wont to boast.[64] Now in all this commendation there is no mention of Christ, but all praise is attributed to the Minorites. He is indignant towards a certain Spaniard who made public an anonymous letter in my favour. (28v)[65] Such people win very little favour with me. But why did our Pantalabus wish to imitate that deed which he detests? It is more wicked to append a false name than none at all. But if the title is true, what is more absurd than to disgrace the order with such an unlearned, lying, stupid, slanderous book? The closer anyone comes to the piety of Francis, the dearer he was, is, and will be to me. But if I were their deadly enemy, as this man falsely says, whom else could I instigate to disgrace the whole order than this Pantalabus?

As a crowning gesture he invites me to recant, promising to shed his sacred blood for me if I recant the things I said that obscure the glory of Christ. (29r) You miserable wretch, do my writings obscure the glory of Christ? And do the likes of you give lustre to Christ's name? What shall I recant? Those silly, false, quibbling articles, which your companions brought forward in Spain, or those which you criticize in your pamphlet? Who ever recanted what he never wrote or thought? Isn't it sufficient for you (I do not speak of pious religious but imposters like you) that hitherto you have duped men's simplicity, but now you oppress the awakened world with lies and tyranny? I did not respond to your pamphlet for it is not worthy of any response; I have merely pointed out the learning, modesty, wisdom, and sanctimony of this truly evangelical Franciscan, and Friar Juan de Zafra commends this little work, an apologia for all sacred religions, in a sort of preface to the Reverend

* * * * *

63 There was a legend concerning a certain Gereon who together with a detachment of fifty men from the Theban Legion, Christian Copts from Thebes in Egypt, was slaughtered for refusing to sacrifice to the pagan gods. Gregory of Tours in his *Liber in gloria martyrum* tells the tale and transfers the scene from Gaul to Cologne, but he does not mention Gereon. One of the oldest churches in Cologne is dedicated to him.

64 1 Cor 9:19

65 The *Epistola de un celoso de Erasmo.* This letter of a 'zealot' may have been written by Diego Cabrero, bishop of Huesca, a strong supporter of Erasmus at the Valladolid conference, as Bataillon has argued, 1 350 n3.

Friar Francisco de los Ángeles, titular cardinal of Santa Croce in Jerusalem.[66] Luis himself dedicates it to the illustrious Prince Lorenzo Suárez,[67] promoter of his studies, in which he declares how much he profited by this work. Not content with this, he commends his nonsense to the reader, seeing that it deserved a triple preface. (4rv) After the successful completion of the work, he sings himself an encomium, foolish trifles about Echo, to which Friar Zafra joins a triumphal song in clever verses addressed to Friar Laxiangus,[68] and he in turn to Friar Zafra. What is left to say save that in all parts of the world sacred religions lend their applause to the triumphant Pantalabus? But, joking aside, we must implore all those who sincerely love true religion not to judge the Franciscan order or any Franciscan from the character of this writer. He wrote in a state of fever, and is more in need of a doctor than a critic. If the Emperor knew this impostor well enough, he would crucify him, even if he were weighted down with ten Franciscan cowls. And if the superiors of the order knew what disgrace he brings to the Franciscan name, they would scourge him and confine him to prison for life. But I suspect that this affair is being carried out under false names, and that it is not a Franciscan, nor even a Christian, but a Jew. For a great crowd of these dregs is involved in these grave times of the church.

* * * * *

66 Juan de Zafra dedicated the Paris reprint to Cardinal Francisco de Quiñones, whose religious name was Friar Francisco de los Ángeles, general of the order.

67 Lorenzo Suárez de Figueroa, marquis of Priego and Count of Feria

68 Unidentified

This page intentionally left blank

LETTER TO CERTAIN HIGHLY IMPUDENT JACKDAWS

Epistola ad quosdam impudentissimos gracculos

INTRODUCTION

Erasmus received a copy of Caravajal's *Dulcoratio amarulentiarum Erasmicae responsionis* (Sweetening of the Bitter Contents of Erasmus' *Responsio*) from Pero Mexía, a Sevillan admirer of his who had written him a letter, no longer extant, on 6 January 1530. In his answer, dated 30 March 1530 (Ep 2300) Erasmus tells his correspondent that he has not read the book and has no intention of doing so. He did glance at it, however, scanning the headings of several pages, as he says. In the opening pages Carvajal accuses Erasmus of making war on Christ under the banner of peace, as all heretics do.[1] Then he reports a hostile speech against Erasmus that someone made at the Valladolid conference.[2] As the letter continues, it becomes obvious that Erasmus did more than just glance at the work. He quotes from later segments as well, pouring ridicule on Carvajal's allegations. He informs Mexía that rather than waste any more words on his opponent, he has decided to write an open letter, directed not only at Carvajal but also at another Franciscan of the Observance, Franz Titelmans. He does not mention either of them by name in that document but specifies that one of the jackdaws was from Salamanca and the other from Brabant. It is clear that he also had in mind the Franciscan Observants who tried to convict him of heresy at the 1527 assembly. In his letter to Mexía Erasmus is much more straightforward, naming both antagonists. He confides to him that he will employ other tactics to deal with those troublemakers by invoking imperial decrees that had been issued against attacks on his person, and similar prohibitions made by Manrique de Lara. He would see to it also that the clandestine printer in Salamanca would be implicated in the offence. Indeed on the very next day after writing to Mexía Erasmus sent a letter to Manrique in which he suggests that it would be conducive to peace in his beloved Spain if the clandestine Spanish publisher of Carvajal's original *Apologia* were published in the *Epistolae floridae* in 1531.

The *Epistola ad quosdam impudentissimos gracculos* was published as a pamphlet, without indication of place or date, by Johann Faber Emmaeus at Freiburg in February 1530. The work was included in the 1540 Basel edition of the *Opera omnia* (IX 1432), but among the *apologiae* rather than the letters. The same is true of the Leiden edition (LB 1745–6).

* * * * *

1 The translation of this letter, Ep 2275, is by Alexander Dalzell, and the notes, slightly modified to fit the present context, are by James Estes.

2 *Dulcoratio* folio 4 recto

LETTER TO CERTAIN HIGHLY IMPUDENT JACKDAWS

DESIDERIUS ERASMUS OF ROTTERDAM WISHES A BETTER FRAME OF MIND TO CERTAIN FRIARS WITHOUT OBSERVANCE

Dear brothers and fathers,[3] I realize what you are up to: you are suborning several brazen and ignorant young men to band together and destroy Erasmus. They have no shame, no brains, there is nothing that can be taken from them, they cannot be apprehended, they are worse than octopuses, moving as they do, from place to place;[4] a whole army hides under a single warrior's shield.

Salamanca has one of them, whose name I used to think was made up. I had never heard it and could not persuade myself that such rudeness lay hidden in that community. His additional name sounded Jewish.[5] It is not just in Spain that there are Jews who conceal their identity: in many countries they live disguised as Christians. But this fellow was unwilling to forego his triumph and thought that the glory should be claimed for his order.

Brabant has another of the same kidney, a man of the most pretentious loquacity.[6] Flaunted modesty is nothing but hypocrisy. (Please realize that these strictures are directed against the wicked – I do not wish to cast a slur on good men.) By this document I give you warning, reverend brothers: suborn, invent, deceive, despise the laws of the emperor and the bishops,[7] publish furtive little pamphlets, from now on I shall not bother to read the rubbish that comes from you or answer it. God himself will find the impious hypocrites. It is to him, whose judgments are just, that I entrust retribution.

* * * * *

3 The Latin is *fratres patres.*

4 *Adagia* II iii 91

5 This initial suspicion that 'Ludovicus Carvaialus' was a pseudonym for someone who was neither a Franciscan nor a Christian but a Jew is voiced in a letter to Johann Henckel, court preacher and confessor to Queen Mary of Hungary, in which Erasmus spoke of 'a certain Ludovicus, who is a defender – God help us! – of his sacred order, and so stupid and foul-mouthed that nothing could dishonor that order more' (Ep 2110 25–7).

6 Clearly Titelmans; see Ep 2261:77–82.

7 For Erasmus' charge that both Carvajal and Titelmans had published works in defiance of decrees of the emperor, local bishops, and other authorities, see Epp 2299:123–7, 2300:24–8, and 52–73, 2301, 2312A:273–7.

How decrepit do I appear in their eyes?[8] Budé is only two years younger than I, Béda perhaps four or five, Latomus three.[9] Up to the present time I have been constantly engaged in grinding labour, which has the most deleterious effect on health and aging. Old man though I am, I can do the work of four vigorous young men. My eyes, thank God, are not failing – many people wonder that I have not gone completely blind long ago. So far I have never used spectacles either in daylight or in lamplight. I have never used a walking stick; I walk quickly with a firm step. My hands are steadier than a young man's. Every day the stone becomes less painful,[10] and if I were to reduce my intellectual labours, I might by the mercy of God, live another fourteen years with my senses intact. But the span of my life is in the hands of God. Those who live with me notice no great loss of intellect or memory. So what is all this about a shriveled death's-head, apt at any moment to fall apart!

What a dead weight these scurrilous clowns are, not just on me but on the whole world! What do they hope to gain from such silly and long-winded drivel? The learned will not read it; godly men will loath it. As yet, I have been unable to find anyone willing to read this gibberish for me. Yet with such stuff they expect to destroy a feeble old man. They could accomplish this more easily with a dagger, for when the aim is murder, it does not matter what weapon is used. Yet this feeble old man has given you Jerome and Cyprian and Augustine and is now giving you Chrysostom,[11] from whose words and from those of Athanasius he has also made many translations.[12] By the use of Greek authors he has thrown light on many passages in the New Testament. Let them read the list and they will see how much this feeble old man has done both for the cause of learning and for godliness. What do these men do? They hamper the work of others with their croak-

* * * * *

8 In the *Dulcoratio* Carvajal had called Erasmus 'a septuagenarian with one foot in Charon's boat' and had made several references to his supposed physical and mental decrepitude.

9 Guillaume Budé was born on 26 January 1468. Noël Béda's birth date is uncertain (c 1470), as is that of Jabobus Latomus (c 1475). As is usual with Erasmus' references to his age, the year of his birth cannot be determined with any certainty from the information provided. But by no calculation was he yet 70. Even if one accepts 28 October 1466 as the date of his birth – and none earlier has ever been suggested – then in February 1530 he was 63.

10 Erasmus appears to have been going through a period of relative freedom from his attacks of the stone.

11 For these editions, see Epp 396, 1464 (Jerome), 1000 (Cyprian), 2157 (Augustine), 2359 (Chrysostom).

12 For the Latin translations of Chrysostom and Athanasius, see Ep 1790.

ing and squawking, while contributing nothing themselves beyond a crude and ignorant gabble. Do they think the world is occupied only by swine and donkeys? On one occasion the emperor gave them authority to make a legal case against me and appointed eminent judges; that was the moment for them to demonstrate their wisdom.[13] By the sort of books they write they expose themselves to the derision of all good and learned men, while I still have the strength to look down on them and mock, even if three thousand were to rise up against me. Learned men and later generations will still hear the song of the swans when jackdaws will be silent.[14] If they wish to destroy this old man, they will need their daggers. Unless they learn to write in a different manner, they will get nothing from the best judges but disgust and mockery. I appeal to you, pious friars, control these donkeys, and to you pious laymen, when you see such madness, give nothing to these communities unless they drive from their midst these babbling idiots; perhaps in this way they will get the warning and come to their senses, for their ears are attached not to their heads but to their bellies.[15] Let them put their stupid 'sweeteners' on their own pap and expect nothing from me.[16] But let them understand where malice leads in the end!

Let me say once more that these words are not directed against the godly. I know there are very many men in that society who detest this scurrilous behavior.[17] When I say these things, these people break in with a threat of a papal excommunication for injury to the Order of Minorites.[18] If this excommunication means anything, it applies in fullest force to those who by their stupid writings make their order an object of hatred to all good and learned men. I have warned them often enough; every day they grow worse; soon they will be ignored. I only wish that had happened at the start! I do not

* * * * *

13 At Valladolid in 1527

14 *Adagia* III iii 97

15 Cf *Adagia* II viii 84. On Erasmus' habit of describing monks, particularly members of the mendicant orders, as devoted to their own bellies, frequently referring to them as 'potbellies,' see Ep 1980 n1.

16 The Latin for 'sweeteners' is *dulcorationes*, an allusion to Carvajal's *Dulcoratio.*

17 See Ep 2300:133–42, where he speaks of his good relations with the Franciscans.

18 In Ep 2300 to Pero Mexía Erasmus refers to a thunderbolt, ie an excommunication from the pope, which he read in the *Dulcoratio* folio 94. It is a composite of selected passages from the bull *Exiit qui seminat* (1279), in which Pope Nicholas III affirms that the way of life of the friars minor has been approved by God, the pope, and the church, and threatens with excommunication any who assert the contrary.

relish croaking back at frogs.[19] Let them boldly turn their backs on every law, both human and divine, and say, 'One must obey God rather than men.'[20] This was rightly said by the apostles, and it is not completely incongruous when these wretches say it. But they and the apostles do not have the same God. In the minds of the apostles God was the creator of heaven and earth; for these men their belly is their God.[21]

Farewell. Erasmus

* * * * *

19 Cf *Adagia* III i 76.
20 Acts 5:29
21 Phil 3:19; cf Ep 1980 n1.

WORKS FREQUENTLY CITED

SHORT-TITLE FORMS
FOR ERASMUS' WORKS

INDEX

WORKS FREQUENTLY CITED

Allen	*Opus epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami* ed P.S. Allen, and H.W. Garrod (Oxford 1906–58) 11 vols plus index
ASD	*Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami* (Amsterdam and Leiden 1969–)
Avilés	Miguel Avilés *Erasmo y la Inquisición* (Madrid 1980)
Bataillon	Marcel Bataillon *Erasme et l'Espagne* rev ed, text by Daniel Devoto, ed Charles Amiel (Geneva 1991) 3 vols
Beltrán de Heredia *Cartulario* VI	'La Conferencia de Valladolid en 1527 en torno a la doctrina de Erasmo' in *Cartulario de la Universidad de Salamanca* VI *Ultimos documentos* ed Vicente Beltrán de Heredia OP (Salamanca 1972)
CCCM	*Corpus christianorum. Continuatio medievalis series Latina* (Turnhout 1953–)
CCSA	*Corpus christianorum series Apocryphorum* (Turnhout 1983–)
CCSL	*Corpus christianorum series Latina (*Turnhout 1953)
CEBR	*Contemporaries of Erasmus. A Biographical Register of the Renaissance and Reformation* ed Peter G. Bietenholz and Thomas B. Deutscher (Toronto 1985–7; repr 2003) 3 vols
Cranfield	C.E.B. Cranfield *A Critical and exegetical commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (Edinburgh 1977)
CSEL	*Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* (Vienna, Leipzig, and Prague 1866–)
CWE	*Collected Works of Erasmus* (Toronto 1974–)
De Jonge	Henk Jan de Jonge 'Erasmus and the *Comma Johanneum*' *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 56 (1980) 381–90
DTC	*Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* ed A. Vacant, E. Mangenot, and E. Amman (Paris 1899–1950) 15 vols in 30 and index
Farge *Orthodoxy*	James K. Farge *Orthodoxy and Reform in Early Reformation France: The Faculty of Theology of Paris, 1500–1543* (Leiden 1985

Farge *Parti*	James K. Farge *Le parti conservateur au xvie siècle: Université conservateur Parlement de Paris à l'époque de la Renaissance et de la Réforme* Paris 1992
Gratian	*Decretum Gratiani in Corpus iuris canonici* ed A. Friedburg (Leipzig 1879–81) 2 vols
Holborn	*Des. Erasmi Roterodami Ausgewählte Werke* ed Hajo Holborn and Annemarie Holborn (Munich 1933)
Homza	Lu Ann Homza 'Erasmus as Hero, or Heretic? Spanish Humanism and the Valladolid Assembly of 1527' RQ 50 (1997) 78–118
LB	*Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami opera omnia* ed J. Leclerc (Leiden 1703–6; repr 1961–2) 10 vols
McConica	James K. McConica 'Erasmus and the Grammar of Consent' *Scrinium Erasmianum* ed Joseph Coppens (Leiden 1969) 2 77–99
Metzger	Bruce Metzger *A Textual Commentary of the Greek New Testament* (London 1971)
ODDC	*Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* ed Frank Leslie Cross and Elizabeth A. Livingston 3rd ed (Oxford 1997)
PG	*Patrologiae cursus completus … series Graeca* ed J.-P. Migne (Paris 1857–66) 5; repr Turnhout) 161 vols. Indexes F. Cavallera (Paris 1912); T. Hopfner (Paris 1928–36) 2 vols
PL	*Patrologiae cursus completus … series Latina* ed J.-P. Migne 1st ed (Paris 1844–55, 1862–5; repr Turnhout) 217 vols plus 4 vols indexes.
QGP	*Quellenschriften zur Geschichte des Protestantismus* (Leipzig 1904–32)
Rummel	Erika Rummel *Erasmus and His Catholic Critics* (Nieuwkoop 1989) 2 vols
Rummel	Erika Rummel 'Erasmus and the Valladolid articles: Intrigue, innuendo, and strategic defense' *Erasmus of Rotterdam. The Man and the Scholar* ed J. Sperna Weiland (Leiden 1988) 69–78
SC	*Sources chrétiennes* (Lyon 1942–)

Seidel Menchi	Silvana Seidel Menchi *Erasmo in Italia, 1520–1580* (Torino 1987)
Souter	*Pelagius' Expositions of Thirteen Epistles of St Paul* ed Alexander Souter (Cambridge 1922–31) 3 vols
WA	*D. Martin Luthers Werke, Kritische Gesamtausgabe* (Weimar 1883–)
Weber	*Biblia sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem* ed R. Weber (Stuttgart 1969–83) 2 vols
Weinandy	Thomas Weinandy OFM *Athanasius: A Theological Introduction* (Aldershot 2007)

SHORT-TITLE FORMS FOR ERASMUS' WORKS

Titles following colons are longer versions of the same, or are alternative titles. Items entirely enclosed in square brackets are of doubtful authorship. For abbreviations, see Works Frequently Cited.

Acta: Academiae Lovaniensis contra Lutherum *Opuscula* / CWE 71
Adagia: Adagiorum chiliades 1508, etc (Adagiorum collectanea for the primitive form, when required) LB II / ASD II-1–9 / CWE 30–6
Admonitio adversus mendacium: Admonitio adversus mendacium et obtrectationem LB X / CWE 78
Annotationes in Novum Testamentum LB VI / ASD VI-5–10 / CWE 51–60
Antibarbari LB X / ASD I-1 / CWE 23
Apologia ad annotationes Stunicae: Apologia respondens ad ea quae Iacobus Lopis Stunica taxaverat in prima duntaxat Novi Testamenti aeditione LB IX / ASD IX-2
Apologia ad Caranzam: Apologia ad Sanctium Caranzam, or Apologia de tribus locis, or Responsio ad annotationem Stunicae … a Sanctio Caranza defensam LB IX / ASD IX-8
Apologia ad Fabrum: Apologia ad Iacobum Fabrum Stapulensem LB IX / ASD IX-3 / CWE 83
Apologia ad prodromon Stunicae LB IX / ASD IX-8
Apologia ad Stunicae conclusiones LB IX / ASD IX-8
Apologia adversus monachos: apologia adversus monachos quosdam Hispanos LB IX
Apologia adversus Petrum Sutorem: Apologia adversus debacchationes Petri Sutoris LB IX
Apologia adversus rhapsodias Alberti Pii: Apologia ad viginti et quattuor libros A. Pii LB IX / ASD IX-6 / CWE 84
Apologia adversus Stunicae Blasphemiae: Apologia adversus libellum Stunicae cui titulum fecit Blasphemiae et impietates Erasmi LB IX / ASD IX-8
Apologia contra Latomi dialogum: Apologia contra Iacobi Latomi dialogum de tribus linguis LB IX / CWE 71
Apologia de 'In principio erat sermo': Apologia palam refellens quorundam seditiosos clamores apud populum ac magnates quo in evangelio Ioannis verterit 'In principio erat sermo' (1520a); Apologia de 'In principio erat sermo' (1520b) LB IX / CWE 73
Apologia de laude matrimonii: Apologia pro declamatione de laude matrimonii LB IX / CWE 71
Apologia de loco 'Omnes quidem': Apologia de loco taxato in publica professione per Nicolaum Ecmondanum theologum et Carmelitanum Lovanii 'Omnes quidem resurgemus' LB IX / CWE 73
Apologia qua respondet invectivis Lei: Apologia qua respondet duabus invectivis Eduardi Lei *Opuscula* / ASD IX-4 / CWE 72
Apophthegmata LB IV / ASD IV-4 / CWE 37–8
Appendix de scriptis Clichtovei LB IX / CWE 83
Appendix respondens ad Sutorem: Appendix respondens ad quaedam Antapologiae Petri Sutoris LB IX

Argumenta: Argumenta in omnes epistolas apostolicas nova (with Paraphrases)
Axiomata pro causa Lutheri: Axiomata pro causa Martini Lutheri *Opuscula* / CWE 71

Brevissima scholia: In Elenchum Alberti Pii brevissima scholia per eundem Erasmum Roterodamum ASD IX-6 / CWE 84

Carmina LB I, IV, V, VIII / ASD I-7 / CWE 85–6
Catalogus lucubrationum LB I / CWE 9 (Ep 1341A)
Christiani hominis institutum, carmen LB V / ASD I-7 / CWE 85–6
Ciceronianus: Dialogus Ciceronianus LB I / ASD I-2 / CWE 28
Colloquia LB I / ASD I-3 / CWE 39–40
Compendium vitae Allen I / CWE 4
Conflictus: Conflictus Thaliae et Barbariei LB I / ASD I-8
[Consilium: Consilium cuiusdam ex animo cupientis esse consultum] *Opuscula* / CWE 71

De bello Turcico: Utilissima consultatio de bello Turcis inferendo, et obiter enarratus psalmus 28 LB V / ASD V-3 / CWE 64
De civilitate: De civilitate morum puerilium LB I / ASD I-8 / CWE 25
Declamatio de morte LB IV / ASD I-2 / CWE 25
Declamatiuncula LB IV / ASD IV-7
Declarationes ad censuras Lutetiae vulgatas: Declarationes ad censuras Lutetiae vulgatas sub nomine facultatis theologiae Parisiensis LB IX / ASD IX-7 / CWE 82
De concordia: De sarcienda ecclesiae concordia, or De amabili ecclesiae concordia [on Psalm 83] LB V / ASD V-3 / CWE 65
De conscribendis epistolis LB I / ASD I-2 / CWE 25
De constructione: De constructione octo partium orationis, or Syntaxis LB I / ASD I-4
De contemptu mundi: Epistola de contemptu mundi LB V / ASD V-1 / CWE 66
De copia: De duplici copia verborum ac rerum LB I / ASD I-6 / CWE 24
De delectu ciborum scholia ASD IX-1 / CWE 73
De esu carnium: Epistola apologetica ad Christophorum episcopum Basiliensem de interdicto esu carnium (published with scholia in a 1532 edition but not in the 1540 Opera) LB IX / ASD IX-1 / CWE 73
De immensa Dei misericordia: Concio de immensa Dei misericordia LB V / ASD V-7 / CWE 70
De libero arbitrio: De libero arbitrio diatribe LB IX / CWE 76
De philosophia evangelica LB VI
De praeparatione: De praeparatione ad mortem LB V / ASD V-1 / CWE 70
De pueris instituendis: De pueris statim ac liberaliter instituendis LB I / ASD I-2 / CWE 26
De puero Iesu: Concio de puero Iesu LB V / ASD V-7 / CWE 29
De puritate tabernaculi: Enarratio psalmi 14 qui est de puritate tabernaculi sive ecclesiae christianae LB V / ASD V-2 / CWE 65
De ratione studii LB I / ASD I-2 / CWE 24
De recta pronuntiatione: De recta latini graecique sermonis pronuntiatione LB I / ASD I-4 / CWE 26
De taedio Iesu: Disputatiuncula de taedio, pavore, tristicia Iesu LB V/ ASD V-7 / CWE 70

Detectio praestigiarum: Detectio praestigiarum cuiusdam libelli Germanice scripti LB X / ASD IX-1 / CWE 78
De vidua christiana LB V / ASD V-6 / CWE 66
De virtute amplectenda: Oratio de virtute amplectenda LB V / CWE 29
[Dialogus bilinguium ac trilinguium: Chonradi Nastadiensis dialogus bilinguium ac trilinguium] *Opuscula* / CWE 7
Dilutio: Dilutio eorum quae Iodocus Clichtoveus scripsit adversus declamationem suasoriam matrimonii / *Dilutio eorum quae Iodocus Clichtoveus scripsit* ed Émile V. Telle (Paris 1968) / CWE 83
Divinationes ad notata Bedae: Divinationes ad notata per Bedam de Paraphrasi Erasmi in Matthaeum, et primo de duabus praemissis epistolis LB IX / ASD IX-5

Ecclesiastes: Ecclesiastes sive de ratione concionandi LB V / ASD V-4–5 / CWE 67–8
Elenchus in censuras Bedae: In N. Bedae censuras erroneas elenchus LB IX / ASD IX-5
Enchiridion: Enchiridion militis christiani LB V / ASD V-8 / CWE 66
Encomium matrimonii (in De conscribendis epistolis)
Encomium medicinae: Declamatio in laudem artis medicae LB I / ASD I-4 / CWE 29
Epistola ad Dorpium LB IX / CWE 3 (Ep 337) / CWE 71
Epistola ad fratres Inferioris Germaniae: Responsio ad fratres Germaniae Inferioris ad epistolam apologeticam incerto autore proditam LB X / ASD IX-1 / CWE 78
Epistola ad gracculos: Epistola ad quosdam imprudentissimos gracculos LB X / CWE 16 (Ep 2275)
Epistola apologetica adversus Stunicam LB IX / ASD IX-8 / CWE 15 (Ep 2172)
Epistola apologetica de Termino LB X / CWE 14 (Ep 2018)
Epistola consolatoria: Epistola consolatoria virginibus sacris, or Epistola consolatoria in adversis LB V / ASD IV-7 / CWE 69
Epistola contra pseudevangelicos: Epistola contra quosdam qui se falso iactant evangelicos LB X / ASD IX-1 / CWE 78
Euripidis Hecuba LB I / ASD I-1
Euripidis Iphigenia in Aulide LB I / ASD I-1
Exomologesis: Exomologesis sive modus confitendi LB V / ASD V-8 / CWE 67
Explanatio symboli: Explanatio symboli apostolorum sive catechismus LB V / ASD V-1 / CWE 70
Ex Plutarcho versa LB IV / ASD IV-2

Formula: Conficiendarum epistolarum formula (see De conscribendis epistolis)

Hyperaspistes LB X / CWE 76–7

In Nucem Ovidii commentarius LB I / ASD I-1 / CWE 29
In Prudentium: Commentarius in duos hymnos Prudentii LB V / ASD V-7 / CWE 29
In psalmum 1: Enarratio primi psalmi, 'Beatus vir,' iuxta tropologiam potissimum LB V / ASD V-2 / CWE 63
In psalmum 2: Commentarius in psalmum 2, 'Quare fremuerunt gentes?' LB V / ASD V-2 / CWE 63
In psalmum 3: Paraphrasis in tertium psalmum, 'Domine quid multiplicate' LB V / ASD V-2 / CWE 63
In psalmum 4: In psalmum quartum concio LB V / ASD V-2 / CWE 63

In psalmum 22: In psalmum 22 enarratio triplex LB V / ASD V-2 / CWE 64
In psalmum 33: Enarratio psalmi 33 LB V / ASD V-3 / CWE 64
In psalmum 38: Enarratio psalmi 38 LB V / ASD V-3 / CWE 65
In psalmum 85: Concionalis interpretatio, plena pietatis, in psalmum 85 LB V / ASD V-3 / CWE 64
Institutio christiani matrimonii LB V / ASD V-6 / CWE 69
Institutio principis christiani LB IV/ ASD IV-1 / CWE 27

Julius exclusus: Dialogus Julius exclusus e coelis] *Opuscula* / ASD I-8 / CWE 27

Lingua LB IV / ASD IV-1a / CWE 29
Liturgia Virginis Matris: Virginis Matris apud Lauretum cultae liturgia LB V / ASD V-1 / CWE 69
Loca quaedam emendata: Loca quaedam in aliquot Erasmi lucubrationibus per ipsum emendata LB IX
Luciani dialogi LB I / ASD I-1

Manifesta mendacia ASD IX-4 / CWE 71
Methodus (see Ratio)
Modus orandi Deum LB V / ASD V-1 / CWE 70
Moria: Moriae encomium LB IV / ASD IV-3 / CWE 27

Notatiunculae: Notatiunculae quaedam extemporales ad naenias Bedaicas, or Responsio ad notulas Bedaicas LB IX / ASD IX-5
Novum Testamentum: Novum Testamentum 1519 and later (Novum instrumentum for the first edition, 1516, when required) LB VI / ASD VI-2, 3, 4

Obsecratio ad Virginem Mariam: Obsecratio sive oratio ad Virginem Mariam in rebus adversis, or Obsecratio ad Virginem Matrem Mariam in rebus adversis LB V / CWE 69
Oratio de pace: Oratio de pace et discordia LB VIII / ASD IV-7
Oratio funebris: Oratio funebris in funere Bertae de Heyen LB VIII / ASD IV-7 / CWE 29

Paean Virgini Matri: Paean Virgini Matri dicendus LB V / CWE 69
Panegyricus: Panegyricus ad Philippum Austriae ducem LB IV / ASD IV-1 / CWE 27
Parabolae: Parabolae sive similia LB I / ASD I-5 / CWE 23
Paraclesis LB V, VI / ASD V-7
Paraphrasis in Elegantias Vallae: Paraphrasis in Elegantias Laurentii Vallae LB I / ASD I-4
Paraphrasis in Matthaeum, etc LB VII / ASD VII-6 / CWE 42–50
Peregrinatio apostolorum: Peregrinatio apostolorum Petri et Pauli LB VI, VII
Precatio ad Virginis filium Iesum LB V / CWE 69
Precatio dominica LB V / CWE 69
Precationes: Precationes aliquot novae LB V / CWE 69
Precatio pro pace ecclesiae: Precatio ad Dominum Iesum pro pace ecclesiae LB IV, V / CWE 69

Prologus supputationis: Prologus in supputationem calumniarum Natalis Bedae (1526), or Prologus supputationis errorum in censuris Bedae (1527) LB IX / ASD IX-5
Purgatio adversus epistolam Lutheri: Purgatio adversus epistolam non sobriam Lutheri LB X / ASD IX-1 / CWE 78

Querela pacis LB IV / ASD IV-2 / CWE 27

Ratio: Ratio seu Methodus compendio perveniendi ad veram theologiam (Methodus for the shorter version originally published in the Novum instrumentum of 1516) LB V, VI
Responsio ad annotationes Lei: Responsio ad annotationes Eduardi Lei LB IX / ASD IX-4 / CWE 72
Responsio ad Collationes: Responsio ad Collationes cuiusdam iuvenis gerontodidascali LB IX / CWE 73
Responsio ad disputationem de divortio: Responsio ad disputationem cuiusdam Phimostomi de divortio LB IX / ASD IX-4 / CWE 83
Responsio ad epistolam Alberti Pii: Responsio ad epistolam paraeneticam Alberti Pii, or Responsio ad exhortationem Pii LB IX / ASD IX-6 / CWE 84
Responsio ad notulas Bedaicas (see Notatiunculae)
Responsio ad Petri Cursii defensionem: Epistola de apologia Cursii LB X / Ep 3032
Responsio adversus febricitantis cuiusdam libellum LB X

Spongia: Spongia adversus aspergines Hutteni LB X / ASD IX-1 / CWE 78
Supputatio: Supputatio errorum in censuris Bedae LB IX
Supputationes: Supputationes errorum in censuris Natalis Bedae: contains Supputatio and reprints of Prologus supputationis; Divinationes ad notata Bedae; Elenchus in censuras Bedae; Appendix respondens ad Sutorem; Appendix de scriptis Clithovei LB IX / ASD IX-5

Tyrannicida: Tyrannicida, declamatio Lucianicae respondens LB I / ASD I-1 / CWE 29

Virginis et martyris comparatio LB V / ASD V-7 / CWE 69
Vita Hieronymi: Vita divi Hieronymi Stridonensis *Opuscula* / CWE 61

This page intentionally left blank

Index of Biblical Sources

Genesis
3:8 143 n591
11:1–9 10 n30
29:23 143 n592
30:14–16 143 n595
30:37–43 143 n593
31:31–45 143 n594

Exodus
8:1–32 10 n28

Judges
16:19–21 143 n596

1 Samuel
21:2–9 129 n532

1 Kings
1:1–4 143 n597

Job
14:4 158 n651

Psalms
5:15 158 n650
44:6 64 n262
136:9 137 n565

Canticles
1:50 48 n195

Isaiah
7:14 60 n233, 141 n585, 142 n588
40:3 73 n300
53:4 142 n586, 142 n588

Jeremiah
32:6–9 128 n528

Daniel
5:32–87 39 n164

Matthew
1:20 79 n346
1:23 59 n232, 64 n263, 141 n585, 142 n589, 159 n654
2:6 133 n551
3:3 73
3:11 130 n538
3:17 130 n541
5:9 60 n237
5:34 144 n600
5:37 145 n603
6:12 7 n18
7:6 70 n292
8:17 142 n587
12:47 163 n671
13:28–30 90 n402
13:55 77 n327
15:11 173 n702
16:15 120 n493
16:18 167 n683
16:23 245 n603
17:27 171 n694
19:5 121 n501
22:40 156 n637

23:8 175 n707
26:51 95 n412
27:9 128 n526
28:19 147 n610

Mark
1:2 128 n527
1:3 73
1:7 130 n539
1:11 73, 130 n542
14:23–5 115 n481

Luke
1:28 161 n661
1:31 79 n345
1:35 78 n339, 160 n657
1:55 6 n16
1:68 67 n280
2:7 162 n666
2:52 77 n335
3:4 73
3:16 130 n539
3:22 73
4:8 145 n604
9:56 94 n411
11:14 7 n8, 66 n270
14:27 195 n442
20:36 60 n237

John
1:1 xviii, 18 n55, 60 nn238–9, 69, 76 n318
1:12 9n26, 18 n36, 48 n192
1:12–15 13 n38
3:10 10 n27
3:17 94 n411
3:18 52 n203
4:18 110 n462
4:20 155 n633
6:53 47 n189, 123 n510
6:63 124 n512, 125 n514
7:39 146 n609
8:39 106 n445
10:30 25 n90
10:33 60 n236
10:35 60 n237
14:9 24 n89
14:14 86 n388
15:12 156 n638
15:16 86 n387
16:8 25 n92
16:14 25 n93
16:23–4 86 n3
17:3 25 n4, 58 n229
17:21 30 n125
20:28 61 n240
20:29 84 n372
44:9 24 n89

Acts
5:3 xx
5:4 xx
5:29 8 n24
7:59 86 n390
10:38 132 n546
14:12 138 n569
15:20 173 n701
15:36–41 133 n 549
17:31 73 n305
19:18 108 n452
20:24 61 n244
20:28 61 n243
26:2–3 12 n34

Romans
1:3 22 n79
1:4 56 n223
1:7 23 n80
1:15 157 n642
2:28 105 n446
3:8 84 n370
3:23 10 n32
5:12 123 n510, 157 nn645–6
5:14 79 n348
6:3–4 104 n438
8:3 134 n555
8:9 105 n444
8:13 125 n515
9:5 xviii, 22 nn80–1, 62 n245, 65 n266, 69 n287, 72 n298
9:20 139 n571
11:33 67 n283

11:36 72 n298
12:18 157 n643
13:1 100 n429
13:7 170 n689
13:8 170 nn687–8, 170 n691
13:10 156 n636
15:20 136 n561
15:56 10 n29
16:25 67 n276

1 Corinthians
2:6–7 70 n293
3:8 46 n183
4:3 137 n566
5:5 98 n424
5:11 98 n423
6:19 25 n95
7:9 47 n188
7:25 111 n469
7:30 176 n712
7:39 121 n502
8:1 125 n513
8:5 84 n369
8:9 61 n241
10:16–20 140 n577
11:6 141 n584
11:13 140 n576
11:19 16 n49
11:23 111 n468
11:24 113 n473
12:6 82 n362
14:3 140 n579
14:15 140 n578
14:35 140 n581
15:19 84 n371
15:31 144 n599
15:33 xxii

2 Corinthians
1:3 67 n281
2:13 135 n556
4:7 130 n536
13:13–14 57 n224

Galatians
2:11–14 134 n551
3:22 10 n31
3:26 48 n192
4:16 105 n442

Ephesians
3:14–16 72 n299
3:20 68 n278
4:13 105 n440
4:22–4 104 n438
6:23 57 n224

Philippians
1:26 144 n601
2:6 23 n86, 63 n252
2:10 70 n294
3:19 xxvi
4:3 8 n22

Colossians
2:3 63 n255
2:9 63 n254
3:9–10 104 n438

1 Timothy
1:6 175 n708
2:8 140 n581
4:3 172 n699
6:4 44

2 Timothy
4:13 130 n535

Titus
2:13 63 nn 257 and 259

Hebrews
1:6 32 n129
1:8 63 n260
6:1 105 n441
13:34 148 n612

1 Peter
1:3 67 n282
2:9 119 n495
3:3 139 n575, 141 n583
5:8 90 n403

Index of Greek and Latin Words Cited

GREEK WORDS

ἀδύνατον 134 n555
ἀνόμιος 85 n363

διάβολος 82 n363

εὐλογητός 67
εὐχαριστῶμεν 115
ἐφ᾽ ᾧ 157

κεχαριτωμένη 162 n664
κτᾶσθαι 89

ματαιολογία 175 n708
μετέχειν 55

ὁμοιότης 79
ὁμοίωμα 79
ὁμοίωσις 79
ὅν ἔχρισεν αὐτόν 133 n550
ὅς ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, ὅς ἐστὶν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός 67
ὅς … ὁ ὤν 67

τῷ καὶ δυναμένῳ 67

ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ 145

φιλοτιμεῖσθαι 136
φιλοτιμία 136
φιλοτιμούμενος 136

LATIN WORDS

alquanto coactius 142 n588
amarulentiae 189
assimilatio 79
a viro cognitam 160 n660

coelibatus 7 n20
concedo nulli, Terminus 186
concipiet 142 n589
Cretizare cum Cretensi 186
crimen capitale 168 n685
curiositas xvii and n32

debita 7 and n18
declamatio 7 n20
deflectere 143 n588
detorquere 142 n588
dissimulare 80 n350
docere 44

eloquium 75, 76
epiphonema 62
Erasmicare cum Erasmo 186
evincere 44

faber 77
Filioque 146 n606
forma Dei 63 n253
fortasse xviii

gratia gratis data 102 n432
gratia gratum faciente 102 and n432, 103
gratia plena 162
gratia pleni 162

habebit 142 n589
homousios 45, 52, 54, 58, 62

huiusmodi 144
huius mundi 144
hypocrisis 80 and n349

impertitio 55
in capitis venire discrimen 8 n23
in sententia concordant 128 n527
insititium 74 n308
insitum 73 n308
irreverentissime 163

logomachia 44

mira depravatio 145 n604
monachatus non est pietas 186

nonnihil ad suum deflectens negocium 142 n588

omnes peccaverunt 157 n646
oratio 75

pars 55
particeps 55
patentissimam 157 n645
pater legalis 77
peccata 7 and n18
peccata mortalia 168 n685
per verba de praesenti 121, 123
per verba de futuro 121, 123
proferre 76
prolativus 76
proloquium 76
promerendum 87 n394

quantulum 164
quatenus 157 n646
quem appreciaverunt 128

salutationem novam ac praeter solitum blandam 161 n662
scortum 206
scrotum 206 n59
sermo 75, 77
servare 7
similitudo 79
studium 44

tyrologus 36 n152

ut aliquid dicam *ὑπερβολικῶς* 151 n623

vana caritas 43 n178
vaniloquium 175 n708
ventres 181 n729
verba de praesenti 121
verba de futuro 123, 124
verberare 77
vero boante 77
Virgo habet in utero 142 n589
vitam coelestem 7 n20

General Index

Abiathar 129 n532
Abimelech 129 n532
Abisag 143 n597
Abraham 38
Acta Andreae 146 n605
Adam 96 n417, 157 n646
Adolf of Burgundy 28 n108
Adrian VI 14 n40
Aegean Sea 129 n534
Agrippa, King 12
Albania xvi
Albertists 42
Alcalá de Henares xi and n8, xii, 182 n731
Alcaraz, Antonio xi n8, xv, xvi, xx
Aldridge, Robert 36 n152, 146 n609
Alexandria 37 nn154 and 156, 46 n182
Algasia 137 n568
Almeida, Esteban de xvii, xix, xxi, 25 n94
Ambrose, 37, 63, 65–9, 85, 88, 150, 158, 162, 170, 178, 193
– *De institutione Virginis et Sanctae Mariae virginitate perpetua* 160 n658
– *De Spiritu Sancto* 37 n158, 48 n194, 85 n380
– *Expositio in Lucam* 162 n669
Ambrosiaster
– *Ad Titum* 63 n259
– *Commentarius in Philippenses* 63 n253
– *Commentarius in Romanos* 66 n273, 65 n268, 66 n273, 67 n275, 158 n647, 170 n688, 171 n692
Amerbach, Boniface xxx
Ananias xx
Andalusia 203 n51
Anianus of Celeda 148 n611
Anselm 76 and n326, 99
Antioch 58 n227, 133 n548, 206 n57
Antwerp 7 n17, 37 n159, 207
Apocalypse 201
Apollinaris of Laodicea 96 and n414
Apollinarists 96 and n414
Apollo 54 n212
Apollos 46 and n182
Apostles' Creed 85 and n382, 150 and n618
Aquinas, Thomas 114, 116 and n488, 122, 136, 198, 205
– *Catena aurea* 148 n611
– *Commentarium in IV libros Sententiarum Magistri Petri Lombardi* 121 n500
– *Summa Theologiae* 43 n175, 72 n297, 102 n432, 113 nn478–9
– *Super epistolas S. Pauli lecturae* 76 n328, 136 n560
– *Supplementum* 121 n500
Arianism xv, xxi, 58 n227, 84, 87 n395
Arians xiv, xvi, xix, xxvi, 21–4, 25 and n94, 27, 29, 30, 33–9, 41–2, 44–7, 49, 53, 58 and n228, 59, 62, 66, 68–9, 74, 76, 86, 87 n395, 88 n398
Aristotle 116 n487, 176, 205
– *Politics* 176 n713
Arius 17 n51, 42, 208
Asia Minor 21 n72, 85 n375
Athanasius xix, 16, 37 and n154, 38, 52, 54, 58, 84, 88, 89, 97, 146, 216 and n12
– *Apologia contra Arianos* 84 n374
– *Athanasian Creed* 88 n398
– *De decreto Nicaeanae synodi* 89 n401

– *De trinitate et Spiritu Sancto* 37
– *Epistola ad Serapionem* 58 n226
– *Oratio contra Arianos* 78 n338
– *Tomus ad Antiochenos* 58 n226
Athenians 73
Augustine xvi, xxi, xxii, 7 n18, 12, 15, 16, 37, 40–1, 43, 47–8, 52, 54 and n215, 59, 63 n253, 64 and n261, 70, 76, 85, 88, 91, 92, 97, 99 n426, 100, 115–16, 122, 123, 127, 128, 130, 131, 132, 133 and n551, 134, 138, 144 and n601, 148–50, 151, 158, 160 and n658, 163, 168 n684, 177, 178, 186, 192 and n18, 193–4, 198, 206 n57, 208, 216 and n11
– *Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum libri quattuor* 47 n190
– *Contra Gaudentium* 92, 408
– *Contra Julianum haeresis Pelagianae defensorem* 123 n510
– *Contra Maximinum Arianorum episcopum* 45 n180
– *De civitate Dei* 122 n507, 158 n649, 193
– *De consensu evangelistarum* 127 n525, 128 n530, 130 n540, 131 nn543–4
– *De doctrina Christiana* 158 n649, 170n688
– *De fide et symbolo* 168 n684
– *De peccatorum meritis et remissione et de baptismo parvulorum* 123 n506
– *De quaestionibus evangelicis* xxi and n52, 99, 100 n427, 131 n545
– *De symbolo ad catechumenos* 150 nn619–20
– *De trinitate* 54 n214, 85 n381, 88 n398
– *Epistolae* 43 n177, 92 nn407–8, 123, 144 n601, 158 n648, 177 n714
– *Retractionum libri duo* 15 n47
– *Sermones* 160 n658
– *Tractatus in Iohannem* 76 n321
Augustinianism xiii, 13, 181 n727
Ausonius 53 and n206
Averroes 205

Babylas, martyr 36
Barbier, Pierre, dean of Tournai 151, 154
Barnabas 133, 138
Basel xxix, xxxii, 2 n3, 11, 34 n35, 69 n288, 78 n343, 80 n351, 107 n455, 121 n504, 147 n609, 155 n635, 204 n54, 214
Basil the Great 16, 84, 88, 192 n18
– *Anatreptikos adversus Eunomium* 85 n375
– *De Spiritu Sancto* 85 n375
Béda, Noël, syndic of the Paris faculty of theology xxii, xxix, 76, 106 and nn447–8, 111 n467, 132, 144, 148, 151 and n621, 155, 173 and n703, 174 n705, 178, 182, 216 and n9
Bede xvi, 37 and n159, 76, 99
– *Commentarius in Joannem* 38, 159
– *In Iohannem expositio* 76 n327
Bel 39 and n164
Benedictines xiii, 13, 181
Berengarius of Tours 97 and n418
Bernard of Clairvaux 161 n663
– *De laudibus virginis matris* 161 n663
Bethlehem 125 n520
Biel, Gabriel 113, 447
– *Canonis misse expositio* 113 n478
Bohemia 115, 196
Bohemians 115–16
Bombace, Paolo xvi
Bonaventure 42 n172
Borgia, Cesare 168 n686
Borgia, Lucrezia 168 n686
Borgia, Rodrigo (Pope Alexander VI) 168 n686
Borssele, Anna van 28 n108
Brabant 203 n51, 214, 215
Bracciolini, Poggio 166 n679
Briart, Jan 7 nn19–20, 174 and n705
Budé, Guillaume 196, 198–9, 216 and n9
Bureau, Nicolas 6 n12
Burgos ix, xxiv
Burgundy xxix, 28 n108, 195 n26

Cabrero, Diego xii, xvi, xx, 187 n6, 210 n65
Caesarea 132 n546
Calais 28 n108
Calvin, John xxxi, 160 n658
Camarina 49 n197
Cana 197

Cappadocian fathers 85 n375
Carmelites 13, 181 n727
Carranza, Sancho 62
Carranza de Miranda xiii, 25, 62 n248
Carthage, Council of 96 n417, 104 n436, 148 and n613
Carthage, Third Council of 148 n613
Carthage, Synod of 104 n436
Carvajal, Luis de xi n5, xxviii, 186–91, 192 n18, 195 n26, 197 n32, 200 n37, 201 n38, 203 nn50–1, 214, 215 nn5–7, 216 n8
– *Apologia monasticae religionis diluens nugas Erasmi* xi n5, 186, 190, 191
– *De restituta theologia* 190
– *Dulcoratio amarulentiarum Erasmicae responsionis ad apologiam Fratris Lodovici Carvaiali* 188, 190, 214 and n2, 216 n8, 217 n16
Castillo, Francisco xi, xiii, xx, xxii
Catena aurea 148 n611
Catholics 163, 169
Cerinthians 20 n72, 69, 74, 76
Cerinthus 21 n72
Charles v, Holy Roman Emperor, king of Spain xi, xii, xxix, xxxi, 14–15, 20, 97 n419, 181 and nn726 and 728, 182, 187 and n4, 195 and n26, 196 and nn28–9, 197, 199, 200, 202, 206, 211, 215, 217
Christianity 96, 104–5, 122 n506, 144, 151, 155, 178, 200, 209
Christian princes 169 and n687, 170–1
Cicero
– *Ad Atticum* 180 n724
Circumcellions 91 n406
Ciruelo, Pedro xxii
Claudianus
– *Carmina minora* 76 n323
Clement VII, pope 14 n40
Clichtove, Josse 37 n156, 174 and n705, 198
Codex Basiliensis 78 n343
Codex Beza 133 n550
Codex Montfortianus xv, 39 n166
Codex Sinaiticus 65 n270
Codex Vaticanus xvi
Codex Washingtonensis 65 n270
Colet, John 27 n105
collecta 86 n385
Cologne xxvii, 3, 35, 210 n63
Colophon 54 n212
Comma Johanneum xiv, xv, 15 n21, 30 n166
Compline 165 n674
Complutensian Polyglot Bible x, 145 n604
Constance, Council of 202 n47
Constantinople, Council of 17 n51, 58 n227, 85 n377
Conventuals 6 n11, 180 n723, 202 n47
Copts 210 n63
Corinth 46 n182
Coronel, Núñez Luis ix, x, xii, xix
Corycaeans 180 n724
Cousturier, Pierre 80, 146, 148
Craeys, Sebastian 7 n17
Cranevelt, Frans van 6 n13
Cyprian 69, 76, 85 n378, 88, 104 and n436, 198, 216 and n11
– *Adversus Iudaeos* 69 n288
– *Expositio Symboli Apostolorum* 85
– *Sermo de Spiritu Sancto* 85
– *Testimonium ad Quirinum* 69 n288, 76 n319
Cyril of Alexandria xvi, 37, 38, 85 n377, 88
– *Thesaurus de sancta et consubstantiali trinitate* 37 n156, 85 n377
Cyzicus 85 n375

Damascene, John xviii
Damasus, pope 58 n237
Daniel 39 n164, 150
Dardanelles 129 n534
David 22, 143
De la Marck, Erard 111 n467
Delila 175
Diagoras of Melos 201 n42
Diana 3 n8
Didymus 37 and nn154 and 158, 38, 48, 52, 85, 88
– *De Spiritu Sancto* 23 n88, 48 n194
Diocletian 91 n406
Diodorus Cronus 201 n41
Dominic xxvii, 6, 14, 183 n87

Dominicans xiii, 13, 14 n343, 153, 181 n727, 187, 193 and n20, 195, 202
Donatists 91 and n406, 92 and n408, 96
Dorp, Martin van 129 and n352
Draco 192
Dulcitius, Roman tribune 92 and n408
Dungersheim, Hieronymus 23 n87
Durand, Guillaume
– *Speculum iudiciale* 121 n504
Durandus of Saint-Pourçain 116 and n488, 121 n504, 122, 205

Easter 53 n204, 147, 150 n619
Eastern Orthodox Church 123
Ebionites 20 n72
Eck, Johann Maier von 132 n545
Egenolff, Christian, Strasbourg printer xix
Egypt 75 nn316–17, 201, 210 n63
Egyptians 101
Emmaeus, Johann Faber 189
Emmeus, printer in Freiburg xxix n74
Enríquez, Alonso xii
Ephesus 3 n81
Ephesus, Council of 85 n377, 96 n417
Epicurus 201 n214, 203 n49
Erasmus: editions and translations
– *Hieronymi vita* 15 n47
– *Omnia opera Divi Eusebii Hieronymi Stridonensis* 107 n455
– *Praefatio in Matthaeum* 102
– *Praefatio in Opera Hilarii* xiv, xx n42, 32 and nn136–7, 80 n351, 87 n395
– *Prologus super Opera Cypriani* 104 n436
Erasmus: original works
– *Adagia* xv n18, 2 n2, 3 n7, 4 n9, 6 n15, 14 n43, 15 n45, 34 n146, 43 n176, 46 n184, 47 n186, 49 nn196–7, 84 n368, 93 n409, 162 n665, 180 n724, 181 n725, 182 n732, 186 n1, 189 n9, 204 n52, 215 n4, 217 nn14–15, 218 n19
– *Annotationes in Novum Testamentum* xiii, xiv, xv, xxiii, xxviii, 36 and n153, 39 and n165, 41, 132 n546, 147, 148, 149 nn614–15, 161 n662, 162, 198; on Matt (2:6) 125 n520; (19:5) 121 n501; on Mark (6:3) 77 n334; on Luke (2:23) 162 n667, (1:35) 78 n339; on John (1:1) 21 nn76–7, 56 n222, 74 n306, (4:3) 36 n153, (20:28) 22 n82; on Acts (10:38) 132 n546, (19:18) 107 n452; on Rom (1:4) 56 n223, (1:7) 23 n88, (5:12) 157 n646, (9:5) 22 n81, (13:8) 170 n688; on 1 Cor (7:39) 121 n502, 122 n505; on Phil (2:6) 23 n86; on Heb (13:34) 148 n612; on 1 John (5:7) xiv n15, 25 n97, 34; *In Apocalypsim* (22:20) 149 n615
– *Antibarbari* 193–4
– *Apologia ad annotationes Stunicae* xvii nn28–9, 59, 61 n245, 63 n256, 132 n546
– *Apologia ad Caranzam* 62 n248
– *Apologia ad Fabrum* 31–2 nn133–4, 64 n261, 148 n612
– *Apologia ad Stunicae conclusiones* 107 n454, 122 n509, 144 n602
– *Apologia adversus debacchationes Petri Sutoris* 80 n350, 146 n607, 148 n612
– *Apologia adversus monachos* xxv, xxvi, xxvii, xxix, xxx, 43 n178
– *Apologia adversus Stunicae Blasphemiae* 117 n490, 120 n497
– *Apologia contra Latomi dialogum* 90 n405
– *Apologia de 'In principio erat sermo'* 74 n306, 77 n332
– *Apologia pro declamatione de laude matrimonii* 174 n705
– *Apologia qua respondet invectivis Lei* 36 n150
– *Apologia respondens ad ea quae Jacobus Lopis Stunica taxaverat in prima duntaxat Novi Testamenti aeditione* 61 n245
– *Carmina*: *Christiani hominis institutum* 27 and nn105–7; *De casa natalitia pueri Iesu* 29 and n114; *Expostulatio Iesu cum homine* 29 and nn115–16; *Obsecratio ad Virginem Mariam* 28 and nn110–11; *Paean Virgini Mariae* 28 and n109; *Precatio ad Virginis filium Iesum* 28 and n108
– *Colloquia* xxii, 26 nn101–3, 103 n435, 121 n504, 123–4, 139 n574, 164, 166, 174; *Adolescentis et scorti* 206 n58; *Convivium religiosum* 103 n435, 104,

129, 139 and n574; *Inquisitio de fide* 26, 27 n104, 101, 102 n430, 150 n618, 167, 168 n684; *Militaria* 109 n459; *Naufragium* 107, 109, 165; *Proci et puellae* 121; *Spectrum* 166; *Virgo μισόγαμος* 121
– *Concio de puero Iesu* 28–9 and n112
– *Declarationes ad censuras Lutetiae vulgatas* 165 n677
– *De delectu ciborum scholia* 139 n573, 172
– *De libero arbitrio* 153 n627, 177
– *De taedio Iesu* 29 n17
– *Detectio praestigiarum* 111 n470, 114 n481
– *Dilutio* 174 n705
– *Divinationes ad notata Bedae* 106 n448, 111 n467, 148 n612, 173 n703
– *Elenchus in censuras Bedae* 111 n467, 151 n621, 155 n634
– *Enarrationes Psalmorum*: *Primi Psalmi* xv, 29 and n113; *Secundi Psalmi* 29–30 and nn118–24; *Quarti Psalmi* 30 and nn123–4
– *Enchiridion* ix, x, 7, 9 n22, 122 and n506, 124–5, 172 n697, 174–6, 177 nn715–17, 178, 186, 194
– *Encomium matrimonii* 7 n19, 31 n128, 174 n705, 194
– *Epistola de interdictu esu carnium* 8 n23, 172 n699
– *Epistolae floridae* 190, 214
– *Epistola in tyrologum quendam impudentissimum calumniatorem* 36 n152
– *Ex Enchiridio notata quaedam* 178 n721
– *Exomologesis* 107 n453, 108 and n458, 109, 110 n463
– *Explanatio symboli* 150 n618, 168 n684
– *Hyperaspistes* 138 n570, 153 n628, 154 n629
– *Institutio principis Christiani* 169 n687, 171
– *Lingua* 193 n19
– *Liturgia matris apud Loretum* 165 n675
– *Loca quaedam in aliquot Erasmi lucubrationibus per ipsum emendata* xxviii
– *Manifesta mendacia* 206 n60
– *Matrimonium Christianum* 31
– *Modus orandi Deum* xvii, xviii, xix, 49, 50, 56, 59 n231, 84, 85 n383, 87 nn391 and 396, 111 n466, 159, 160 n659, 167
– *Moriae encomium* 6 n14, 175 nn706 and 708, 178 n720, 201 and nn38 and 45, 203, 204
– *Paraphrases in Novum Testamentum* xiv, xvi, xxviii, 6 n14, 26, 97, 192–3
– *Paraphrasis in Matthaeum* xxi, 26 and n98, 90, 97, 100 and n428, 101, 104, 106 and n450, 117 n491
– *Paraphrasis in Marcum* 26
– *Paraphrasis in Lucam* 26 and n100
– *Paraphrasis in Joannem* xiv, 18–20 nn54–71, 21 n73, 22 n82, 24 nn89–92, 147 n609, 155 n635, 156 nn639–41
– *Paraphrasis in Romanos* 22 nn79–80, 171 n693
– *Paraphrasis in 1 Corinthios* 25 nn95–6, 111
– *Paraphrasis in Philippenses* 23 and n86, 68 n286
– *Paraphrasis in 1 Joannis Epistolam* xvi n22
– *Praefatio ad regem Ferdinandum* 20, 72
– *Precatio dominica* 199 n37
– *Querela pacis* 30 and n125
– *Ratio* (Methodus) 31 nn126–7, 117 n489, 119 n494, 139 n572, 140 n582, 143 n590, 175 n708
– *Responsio ad annotationes Lei* xiv, 53 nn207–9, 54 n215, 55 nn216–17, 219, 220, 122 n508, 129 n533, 142 nn588–9, 144 n602, 148 n612, 161 n662
– *Responsio ad notulas Bedaicas* 106 n447
– *Spongia* 112 n471, 151 n625, 168, 177
– *Supputatio* xxix, 90 and n404, 102 n433, 106 n449, 111 n467, 144 n602, 148 n612, 151 n621, 155 n634, 178
Eucharist xiv, 47 and n190, 48, 59, 97 n418, 101, 111 n466, 112 n470, 113 and n477, 115–17, 123 n510, 124, 168, 204 n54
Eunomius 85 and n375
Eusebius of Caesarea 113 n479
Eusebius of Emesa 113 and n479
Eustochium 7

Exiit qui seminat, papal bull 217 n18
Exsurge, Domine, papal bull xxii, 35 n149, 102 n431

Fabiola 107, 109 n460
Ferdinand I, archduke of Austria, king of Bohemia and Hungary 20
Fernández, Alonso ix, x
Fisher, John 209
Fonseca, Alonso de, Primate of Spain x and n4, xxvi, 181 n726, 182 n730, 202 and n48
France xxxi
Francis, St xxviii, 6 and n11, 14, 183, 187–90, 191 n14, 192 and n18, 194, 195 n26, 198, 202, 205, 210
Francis I, king of France 195 and n26, 196
Franciscans xiii, 13, 180, 181 n727, 187–9, 191–2, 195, 199, 202, 204, 209, 217 n16
Francisco de los Ángeles 211
Franck, Sebastian xxxi, 30 and n77, 189, 214
– *Chronica* or *Zeytbuch und Geschychtbibel* xxx
Frankfurt 188
Freiburg xxix, 195–6, 206
Froben, Hieronymus xxvi–xxvii, 3, 12 n35, 87 n395, 155 n635
Froben, Johann 3 n6, 36, 152, 158 n647

Gattinara, Mercurino ix, x, xiii, xxvi n71, 15 n48, 187 n6, 188, 203 n51
Gaul 210 n63
Geldenhouwer, Gerardus xxviii, xxix and n74, xxx
– *D.Erasmi Roterdami Annotationes in leges pontificias et caesareas de haereticis. Epistolae aliquot Gerardi Noviomagi* xxix
Gelderland 203 n51
Genethliacs 158 n649
Geneva xiii n13, 174 n705, 187 n6
George of Trebizond 37 n156
Gereon 210 n63
Germany 8
Gerson, Jean 109 n459
– *Contra curiositatem studentium* xvii n32
Gethsemane 29 n117
Glossa ordinaria 110 n465, 128 n528
Goliath 191
Gómez, Miguel xiii, xxi, xxii
Gouveia, Diego de xi n8, xii, xvi, xxvii, xxviii and 317
Gracián, Diego 3 n5
Gratian, *Decretals* 96 n416, 110 n465, 114 n480, 121 n500
Gregory of Tours 210 n63
– *Liber in gloria martyrum* 210 n63
– *Liber de miraculis beati Andreae* 146 n605
Guevara, Antonio xii, xiii

Hagenau xxxi
Hegendorff, Christoph 174 n704
Helvidius 159 n655
Henckel, Johann 215 n5
Henry VIII 11, 181 n728, 209 n61
heresies x, xi, xxix, 16, 20, 96, 98, 152
Hermes 138
Hieracus of Leontopolis 75 and n317
Hilary, bishop of Poitiers xiv, xviii, xix, xx, 32, 37, 47, 48, 52, 54 and n215, 55–6, 58 and n228, 63 n253, 74 and n308, 88, 89, 198
– *Commentarius in Matthaeum* 160 n658
– *Contra Arianos vel Auxentium Mediolanensem* xx n46
– *De synodis* 74 n307, 75 nn309 and 311
– *De trinitate* xix, xx, 47 n191, 52 n201, 54 n215, 55 n218, 58 nn225 and 228, 63 n253, 75 nn310, 312, 314, 316–17, 87 nn392 and 394
Holywell 166 n680
Homer 2 n2
Horace
– *Satires* 191
Huesca 187
Hutten, Ulrich von 112, 151 and n627, 174 n704
Hyperbolus 17 n51

Iliad 2 n2
Ingolstadt 131 n546

Innocent I, pope 123 and n510
Inquisition ix, x, xiv, xxi, xxii, xxix, xxx, xxxi, 82, 90, 96–7, 101–4, 120, 124, 134, 137, 139, 141–2, 148, 151, 153, 156, 158–9, 202
Inquisitors xix, 64 n267, 95, 122 n506, 142 n588, 161 n662
Isaiah 59, 141, 142 nn588–9, 150, 159
Isidore
– *Etymologies* 77 nn331–2
Italy 165 n675

Jacob 143 and n595
Jerez 190
Jerome, xiv, xvi, xvii, xxi, xxii, xxviii, 7 and n21, 15 and n47, 16, 34, 35, 36, 38, 40, 41, 47, 58, 60, 64 n261, 70, 72, 73, 74, 76, 85, 87, 88, 89 and n400, 97 n419, 98, 107, 126, 127, 128 and n528, 129, 130, 135, 137, 142, 149, 150–1, 157, 158 and n647, 159, 178, 187, 192, 197, 198, 204 n54, 205, 206, 208, 216 and n11
– *Adversus Jovinianum* 47 n187, 96 n417, 205 n55
– *Commentaria in Isaiam* 60 n234
– *Commentarius in Ephesios* 76 n320
– *Commentarius in evangelium secundum Matthaeum* 73 n303, 98 n425, 130 n537, 142 n589
– *Commentarius in Michaeam* 126 nn520 and 522, 197 n31
– *De Mariae virginitate perpetua adversus Helvidium* 159 n655, 160 n658
– *De optimo genere interpretandi* 126 n520
– *De Spiritu Sancto* (translation of a work of Didymus) 37 n154
– *De viris illustribus* 149 n614
– *Dialogus contra Luciferianos* 87 n395
– *Epistolae* 7 n21, 58 n227, 63, 67, 76 n329, 135 n558, 137 nn567–8, 206 n57
– *Praefatio Hieronymi in Danielem prophetam* 39 n164
– *Praefatio in librum Didymi Alexandrini de Spiritu Sancto* 37 n158
– *Praefatio in librum psalmorum* 16 n50
Jerusalem, Council of 173 and n701, 211
Jews 8, 9, 13, 60 and n236, 62, 69, 73, 105, 215
John XXII, pope 15 n47
John Chrysostom xxi, 16, 36 and n152, 37, 68, 70, 73, 97, 146, 147 and n610, 148 and n611, 158, 163 and n671, 198, 216 and nn11–12
– *Commentarius in Matthaeum* xxi n51, 98 n420, 142 n588
– *Commentarius in Romanos* 68 n284, 158 n647
– *De Babyla martyre* 36 n152, 146 n609
– *Homilia in Matthaeum* 163 n672, 198 n33
– *Homilia in Romanos* 158 n647, 170 n688
John the Baptist 130
Jonah 9, 13
Joseph 77, 159 n655, 164
Jovinian 47, 96 and n417, 157, 159, 205
Jud, Leo
– *Das hochgelerten Erasmi von Roterdam uund Doctor Martin Luthers maynung vom Nachtmal uunsers herren Jhesu Christi* 111–12 n470
Judah 125 n520
Judaism 141, 155, 173, 193
Julian the Apostate 123
Justinian 96 n415
– *Codex Justiniani* 95 n413

Karlstadt, Andreas 114 n481

Lactantius 54, 76 and n324
– *Divinae Institutiones* 54 n212
Laodicea 96 n44
Latomus, Jacobus 90 and n405, 216 n9
Laxiangus 211
Leah 143 and n595
Lee, Edward xi, xiv, xv, 12, 17 n53, 21 n77, 32, 35 n148, 36, 40, 53–6, 77 n336, 107, 108, 122, 129, 132, 141–4, 148 and n612, 161 and n662, 181 n728
Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques 31n133, 148, 182 n733
Leo X, pope xvi, 35, 67 and n149, 102 n431
Leontopolis 75 n317

Lerma, Pedro xi n8
Lombard, Peter
– *Sententiae* 121 n500
London 27 n105
López de Béjar, Gil xiii, xviii
Lord's Prayer 7, 65 n270, 71, 84 n373, 199 and n37
Lord's Supper 114 n481, 140
Loreto 165 n675
Louvain 7 nn19 and 21, 35, 168 n685, 174 n705, 193 n20, 207
Lucifer, bishop of Cagliari 87 n395
Lucian of Samosata 201 n43
Luther, Martin xviii, xxii–xxiii, xxix, xxx, 6, 13 n36, 27 n104, 34, 35 and n149, 85 n384, 102 and n431, 103, 111, 112 and n470, 113, 115, 117, 137 and n564, 138 n570, 151–4, 155 and n633, 160 n658, 169, 179, 181, 186, 192, 199, 201, 209 n61
– *De fundamentis devotariorum* 186 n2, 199 n35
– *De servo arbitrio* 138 n570, 153 n627, 203 n49
Lutherans 27, 169

Macedonius, Roman tribune 92 and n408
Madrid xiii and n11, 195 n26
Magnificat 6
Maldonado, Juan ix, x, xxiv
Manichaeans 96, 158
Manrique de Lara, Alonso Archbishop of Seville, Inquisitor-general ix, x, xii, xix, xxiii and n64, xxv–xxvii, 2 and n4, 12, 14 n42, 15 n48, 31 n133, 43 n178, 181 n726, 182 n730, 189, 190, 214
Marck, Erard de la, bishop of Liège 111
Margalho, Pedro xxii
Mary, mother of God 19, 21 n73, 28, 48, 52, 77 n337, 159 and n655, 164, 165 nn674–5, 166, 198
Mary, Queen of Hungary 215 n5
Mass xii, xx, 72, 84 and n373, 86 nn385–6, 88, 101, 112–13, 115 n483, 125, 152, 182
Maximinus 45
Melanchthon xix
Menander xxii
Messene 2 n2
Mexía, Cristóbal 189
Mexía, Pero 189, 190, 214, 217 n18
Micah 125, 126 n520, 133 n551, 197 n31
Middelbury, Nicholas 207
Minorites 205, 209, 210, 217
monasticism 186, 188, 192, 194, 199, 200, 202
monks ix, x, xi, xiii, xvii, xviii, xix, xxii, xxiii–xxiv, xxvi, xxviii, xxx, 4 n10, 5, 6, 10, 14 n42, 15 n48, 25 n94, 35 and n48, 36 n53, 87 n394, 93–4, 97, 107 and n453, 123 n504, 147 n609, 155 n632, 182–3, 187–9, 191–2, 193 and n21, 194 n23, 200–2, 204–5, 208–9, 217 n15
Monophysitism 96 n414
Montfort, Rev Thomas xv
More, Thomas 33, 201 n43
Moses 63, 121, 123, 192 n18, 194
Mount Corycus 180 n724
Muses 60
Mysia 85 n375

Nazianzus, Gregory 37, 146
– *Oratio theologica* 37 n155
Nebrija, Antonio de 187, 198
Nestor 2 n2
Nicaea, Council of 17 n51, 59, 85, 208
Nicholas III, pope 217 n18
Ninevites 10
Noetians 42 and n171
Noetus 42
nominalists 42
North Africa 91 n406, 92 n408

Observants 6 and n11, 180 and n723, 186, 189, 207
Ockham 42 n172
Oecolampadius 143 n589
Olivar, Pedro Juan ix, x and n3, xi n7, xiv, 14 and n42, 15 n48
Olmedo xi
Origen 37 n154, 64 n261, 75 n317, 97 n419, 128 n528, 147 and n610, 162, 170

– *Commentarius in Romanos* 170 n688
– *Homilia in Lucam* 162 n669
Orosio 186, 203 n51

pagans 13, 25, 74, 166, 170
Palencia ix
Pammachius 126
Pamphylia 180 n724
Pantalabus 191–8, 201–5, 207–8, 210–11
Paris xi, xxii–xxiv, 15
Paul, the apostle xix, xx, xxii, xxvi, 8, 12, 13, 22, 44, 46–9, 52, 57, 61, 63, 64 n267, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 80, 82, 85, 98, 100, 104–5, 111, 125, 129, 133 and n548, 134, 135 and nn556 and 558, 136–9, 140–2, 144, 148–9, 151 and n623, 157–8, 170, 171–3, 175, 187, 188, 193–4, 197, 206 n57, 208, 210
Paulinus of Nola 163 and n672
Pedro de Ciria xx
Pelagianism 96 n417, 157 n646, 158 n651
Pelagians 47, 96 and n417, 157–9
Pellicanus, Conradus 204 n54
Peter, the apostle xx, 7, 48, 67, 73, 104, 117 and n491, 118–20, 132 n546, 133, 134 n551, 135 n558, 137, 139–40, 145 n604, 148–9, 171, 173 and n701, 206 and n57, 208
Pharaoh 10
Pharisaism 209
Pharisees 110, 175, 193, 195
Philip of Burgundy xxviii–xxix
Pico della Miranda 187
Pierre de Cornes 201 n38
Plato
– *Republic* 176 n713
Plautus 199
Plutarch 2
Poliziano 187
Pontano 166 n679
Porphyry of Tyre 23 and n84
Préjano, Fernando de xii
Priapus 207
Priego 211 n67
Prudentius 76, 198
– *Carmen natalitium Jesu* 33
– *Cathemerinon* 76 n322, 198 n34
– *De Epiphania Domini* 33
Psalms 52, 67, 71–2, 140, 158, 201–2
Pseudo-Dionysius xviii
Pseudo-Jerome xvii, 158 n647
– *Prologus septem epistolarum canonicarum* xvii n28
Puy-en-Vélay 165 n674
Pylos 2 n2

Quintana, Juan de xi n8, xii, xxxi

Rabbis 175, 193 and n21
Ragusa (modern Dubrovnik) 78 n343
Rationale divinorum officiorum xx
Remigius of Auxerre 76 and n325, 99
Reuben 143 n595
Rochester 209 n61
Roman pontiff 96, 117, 118, 119, 120, 151–2, 154, 175, 194
Rome xvi, xxii, xxix, 48, 97 n418, 117, 167 n683, 196 and n28, 206
Rufinus of Aquileia
– *Expositio in Symbolum apostolorum* 85 n379, 168 n684
Ruiz de Virués, Jerónimo xi, xiii, 3 n5

Sabellius 41 n170, 42, 75 and n313
sack of Rome 196
Safont, Benet xi and n7
Saint-Omer 28 n108
Salamanca xi and n8, xii–xiii, xxviii, 181, 182 n731, 186, 188, 190, 202, 203 n51, 214–15
Samson 175
Samunde, Martín de xii, xvii
San Domingo de Silos 201 n40
Santa Croce 211
San Vicente, Juan de ix
Saracens 208
Satan xx, 83, 90, 99, 105, 146 n604, 209
Scholasticism 42 n172
Scholastics 38, 43–4, 153, 178
Scotus, Duns 42 n172, 48, 116, 122, 203, 205
– *Commentarii in Sententiis* 43 n174
– *Quaestiones quodlibetales* 116 n469
– *Reportata Parisiensia* 116 n487
Septuagint 73, 126 n520, 129, 158 n651

Servetus, Michael
– *De trinitatis erroribus* xxxi
Setzer, Johann xxxi
Seville 2, 12, 35, 89, 181 n726, 182, 190, 202 n729
Sicilians 203
Sicily 203
Sidrach, Misach, and Abdenago 39 n164
Sigismund 196
Slechta, John 115
Smyrna 42 n171
Solon 192
Sorbonne xxiv, 186, 209
Spain ix, x, xi, xxiii–xxvi, xxviii, 2, 4, 5, 12, 16, 181 and nn726 and 728, 188–90, 197, 200, 202, 204, 209–10, 214–15
Spaniards xxi, xxvi, xxix, 80 n349, 128 n527, 135 n555, 144 n599, 145 n604, 151 n623, 163 n671, 168 n685, 187, 196–7, 201
Spanish monks xxx, 122 n504
Stephen, St 86
Stojkovic, Cardinal Ivan 78 n343
St Paul's School 27 n105
Strasbourg xix, xxx, xxxi
Suárez de Figueroa, Don Lorenzo 186, 192 n18, 211 n67
Susanna 39 and n164
Sybilline Oracles 55 n215
Syria 58 n227, 113 n479
Syrians 132

Teutonicus, Joannes 110 n465
– *Glossa ordinaria* 110 n465, 128 n528
Textus Receptus 65
Theban Legion 210 n63
Thebes 210 n63
Theodorici, Vincentius 7 n21
Theodosius I 93, 94 n410
Theophylact xxi, 37, 68, 78, 86, 98, 136, 146, 148 and n611, 149
– *Enarratio in evangelium Ioannis* 86, 389
– *Enarratio in evangelium Matthaei* 98 n421
– *Enarratio in Lucam* 78 n340
– *Expositio in epistolam ad Romanos* 68 n285, 170 n688
– *Expositio in epistolam ad Corinthios 2* 136 n560
Thomas, the apostle xviii, 22, 61
Titelmans, Frans 157 nn646, 158 n651, 189, 214, 215 nn6–7
Titus 6, 135 nn556 and 558, 136–7
Toledo x, xi, xxvi, 146 n606, 181 n726, 182 nn730–1, 202 and n48
Toledo, Third Synod of 146 n606
Tournai 6 n12
Tournehem, castle of 28 n108
Tower Hill 209 n61
Transsilvanus, Maximus xiii
Trapezuntius 163 n671
Trent, Council of 168 n684, 190
Trinitarians xiii, 13, 181 n727
Trinity College Dublin xv
Troas 129
Tyrologi (cheese-connoisseurs) 9 n25
Tyrologus 146

Ulpian
– *Digest* 121 n500
Utenheim, Christop von 172 n698
Utrecht xix

Valdés, Alfonso de x, xiii, xxvii n71, 15 n48, 187 nn4 and 6, 188, 203 n51
Valentinians 75 n316, 76
Valentinus 75 and n316, 76
Valladolid ix, xi and n8, xii–xiii, xv, xxiii, xxv, xxviii, xxxi, 25 n94, 36 n153, 186, 187 n6, 189, 210 n65, 214, 217 n13
Vázquez, Dionisio xi
Venantius Fortunatus
– *Ave maris stella* 83 n365
Veni, Sancte Spiritus liturgical sequence 53 n204
Venus 165
Victimae paschali laudes liturgical sequence 53 n204
Vienne xxxi
Virgil 53 and n206
– *Aeneid* 43 n79
– *Georgics* 195 n27
Virgin Mary xiv, xxiii, 28, 75, 76, 79, 83, 153, 160 and n658, 161, 162 and n669, 163, 167 and n681, 182, 197, 208, 209

Virgin Mother 93
Virués, Ruiz de xi, xiii, 3 n5
Vitoria, Francisco xi n8, xvi–xviii, xix, xxi, xxiii, xxiv, xxv
Vives, Juan Luis xxii–xxiv, 193
Volz, Paul 8 n22
Vulgate xv, 7 n18, 8 n22, 36, 64 n265, 71 n296, 77 n337, 134 n555, 142 n589, 146 n609, 157 n646, 161 n662, 175 n708, 197 n31

Winifred, St 166 n680
Wittenberg xix

Zacharias 67
Zafra, Juan de 192, 210, 211 and n66
Zosimus I, pope 123 and n510
Zúñiga, López Diego xiv, xvii–xviii, 17 n53, 36, 56–7, 59, 60, 61 n242, 62, 67 n274, 68, 107, 119, 132 n546, 144, 186
Zürich 112 n470, 204 n54
Zwingli, Huldrych 112 n470, 160 n658, 204 and n54

This page intentionally left blank

The design of
THE COLLECTED WORKS
OF ERASMUS
was created
by
ALLAN FLEMING
1929–1977
for
the University
of Toronto
Press